



Division B51197

Section .S649
1921

The International Theological Library.

EDITED BY

CHARLES A. BRIGGS, D.D.,

*Edward Robinson Professor of Biblical Theology, Union Theological
Seminary, New York ;*

AND

STEWART D. F. SALMOND, D.D.,

*Professor of Systematic Theology and New Testament Exegesis,
Free Church College, Aberdeen.*

OLD TESTAMENT HISTORY.

BY PROF. HENRY PRESERVED SMITH, D.D.

INTERNATIONAL THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY



OLD TESTAMENT HISTORY

BY

HENRY PRESERVED SMITH, D.D.

PROFESSOR OF BIBLICAL HISTORY AND INTERPRETATION
IN AMHERST COLLEGE

NEW YORK
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS
1921

COPYRIGHT, 1903, BY
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

Published, September, 1903

To

ARTHUR CUSHMAN McGIFFERT

IN MEMORY OF THE YEARS

1888 TO 1893

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. THE SOURCES	I
II. THE ORIGINS	11
III. THE PATRIARCHS	35
IV. EGYPT AND THE DESERT	52
V. THE CONQUEST	73
VI. THE HEROES	87
VII. THE EARLY MONARCHY	106
VIII. DAVID	129
IX. SOLOMON	156
X. FROM JEROBOAM TO JEHU	177
XI. THE HOUSE OF JEHU	198
XII. THE FALL OF SAMARIA	219
XIII. HEZEKIAH AND MANASSEH	238
XIV. JOSIAH AND HIS SONS	260
XV. THE EXILE	301
XVI. THE TEMPLE REBUILT	344
XVII. NEHEMIAH AND AFTER	382
XVIII. THE GREEK PERIOD	413
XIX. A NEW HEROIC AGE	441
XX. THE PRIEST-KINGS	470
CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE	499
INDEX OF SUBJECTS	503
INDEX OF SCRIPTURE PASSAGES	510

PREFACE

THE purpose of the present volume is to put into narrative form the results of recent Old Testament study. The book might have been called a History of Israel ; but that title would indicate that the subject was treated in its relation to the general history of mankind, whereas for a series of theological handbooks it should be treated in its relation to our religion. From the beginning the Christian Church has assigned special importance to the body of writings which we call the Old Testament—Old Covenant would perhaps be a better title. To understand these writings is one of the first aims of theological study, and the endeavour to understand them has given rise to a number of separate sciences—Old Testament Introduction, Philology, Geography, Chronology, Biblical Theology of the Old Testament, and others. In our time it has become increasingly clear that no literature (and the Old Testament is first of all a literature) can be understood without tracing the process of growth by which it came into being. The immense critical labour that has been expended on the Old Testament of late years is motivated by a desire to discover the stages of growth by which this literature became what it is.

For the understanding of the literature we cannot stop with the investigation of purely literary questions. Criticism is a means to something beyond itself. The results of critical inquiry must be brought into relation with each other by a constructive reproduction of what has actually taken place in the past ; in other words, criticism must result in history before it can be considered complete. It follows that every new advance in criticism involves a rewriting of history. Otherwise it would be presumptuous to do again what has already been so often done before. As in what we call secular history new treatises are

poured from the press year by year, so it must be with Biblical and ecclesiastical history. No science is ever complete, and Biblical science is no exception to the rule. The new and in some respects startling results of recent Biblical science call for a new historical reconstruction. In recognising the necessity thus laid upon them, Old Testament students only put themselves in line with students in other branches of learning. Every other history is rewritten as often as the documents on which it is founded are seen in a new light; Old Testament history cannot be an exception.

Minute and careful study of the Old Testament is no new thing; it has been carried on in every age since the time of the Apostles. Especially in the Protestant Church during the seventeenth century it was pursued with a thoroughness and devotion which are beyond praise. What distinguishes the work of our own day from that so laboriously carried on in earlier times is the new point of view. There was a time when, for theological study at least, the work of the critic consisted mainly in settling the meaning of each separate Biblical statement. Each *dictum* was then reckoned with in its isolation, as an authentic declaration of truth. In our day we find it impossible to content ourselves with this method of treatment. We cannot feel that we understand a Biblical statement when we know simply what it says. We are constantly going behind the word to the personality of the author; we inquire concerning his times, his circumstances, his ideals, his relation to his predecessors, his place in the chain of development. As we do not fully assure ourselves that our own recollections mean what we think they mean unless we can bring them into harmonious relations of time and space with other recollections, so it is with the traditions of the past—we must know not only what *was* at a certain date, but also how it is related to what came before and after.

Historical criticism is simply the careful examination of the facts of tradition in order to bring them into harmonious relation. It has always been exercised by reflecting men when they endeavor

oured to ascertain what had taken place in earlier ages. It is only within recent times, however, that criticism has been developed into a science. This is due partly to the increased systematisation of all branches of inquiry, partly to the discovery that all ancient documents must be subjected to the same process before they can be made to yield assured historical data. This necessity arises first from the constant intrusion of error in the process of transmission. The scribes to whom we owe the preservation of all ancient books can make no claim to infallibility. Mistakes in copying, in editing, in compiling, are liable to occur at every stage of the process of transmission. So far as our evidence concerning the past is contained in written documents it cannot be used until these mistakes are removed. Their removal is the object of textual criticism. For a long time scholars were not disposed to concede that the Old Testament was in need of textual criticism. For reasons which we easily understand, and which indeed command our sympathy, the Word of God (as the Bible was somewhat inexactly called) was supposed to be exempt from the ordinary tendencies of manuscript transmission. But at the present time the large majority of scholars find it necessary to examine the Old Testament text by the same methods which are applied to other ancient documents. It needs no demonstration that the historian must be familiar with these methods, and that he cannot use the Old Testament text except as it has been subjected to them.

The line between textual and historical criticism (the higher criticism as it is usually called) is not easily drawn, and indeed there is no sharp line of demarcation between them. The higher criticism is simply the process of examining and weighing the evidence in our hands. This evidence may be in the form of tradition, that is, documents which profess to tell us what has taken place, or in the form of monuments which indicate what has taken place without the direct purpose of describing it. Evidently a document which contains a tradition is also a monument of the time when the tradition took shape. Evidence concerning the past,

whether direct (traditional) or circumstantial (monumental), must be interrogated before it can be used. For the danger of misapprehension is as constant a factor here as is the danger of corruption in the case of manuscript transmission. To understand our tradition, to date and locate our monuments—this is the object of the higher criticism. As applied to the Bible it is the same science which is constantly used in examining other historical documents.

The beginnings of Biblical higher criticism may be traced to Ibn Ezra, to Spinoza, with more justice to Astruc, as the beginnings of Biblical textual criticism may be traced to Cappel, Morin, and Simon. But it is only within the last forty years that both sciences have been recognised among English-speaking scholars. This period has been a period of conflict, but now the recognition of the validity of criticism in both kinds may be said to be complete. In the domain of the higher criticism the result has been to show the extraordinary complexity of the problems with which we have to deal. What we seek to do is to date the documents, analyse them where they are composite, estimate the personality of the writers, and arrange the results into a consistent picture. The complexity of the material ought not to surprise us. The Bible is a book of edification, and a book of edification must be recast in order to meet the wants of an age different from the one for which it was first written. The Old Testament has gone through this process more than once; what modern scholars seek to attain by notes and comments, ancient scribes sought to attain by insertions and changes in the text. These repeated modifications of the text—redactions, combinations, glosses—are the first object of the historian's interest, for they are the marks of the historical process which he seeks to reconstruct. It is the realisation of this fact which makes the Old Testament study of to-day so different from the Old Testament study of fifty years ago.

It may be objected that if the problem be indeed so complex the historian should suspend his labours, and that he should not

write the history till the critical work is all done. But it is a mistake to suppose that the constructive work can wait till the criticism is complete. The constructive work is itself necessary to the critic. If history is based on criticism, criticism is tested by history. Criticism dates the documents; history arranges the testimony of the documents according to the scheme presented by criticism. If the resulting picture is inharmonious, out of proportion, or unnatural, it becomes evident that the criticism has been incomplete or one-sided. The analysis of the critic must constantly be checked by the historian's synthesis. Moreover, the historical presentation is needed to guard the critic from too great subjectivity. His danger is that in the details of the critical examination he may forget the larger whole with which he has to deal. So far as there is any justification for the charge that the higher critics are negative and destructive, it will be found in the fact that one and another has neglected to test his results by a positive combination of them in historic form. When the results are fairly tested by such a constructive use of them, they will be seen not only to further a correct appreciation of the individual documents or monuments, but also to give a more intelligible presentation of the whole subject with which they deal.¹

As in all other history, so in Old Testament history, what interests us is the stream or movement of which the isolated facts are indications. In endeavouring to form a clear conception of this stream or movement, we are constantly compelled to lament the paucity of our materials. What we wish to reproduce is the process which extended over a thousand years, and we have as

¹ The most complete discussion of the relation between criticism and history may be found in Bernheim, *Lehrbuch der historischen Methode*³ (1903). The lectures of Freeman, *Methods of Historical Study*, contain valuable hints, but fall far short of a systematic discussion. A suggestive little book is Droysen, *Gundriss der Historik*, published in English translation by E. Benjamin Andrews, *Outline of the Principles of History* (1893). On the progress of critical study as applied to the Bible (especially the Old Testament) the reader should consult the preface to Driver, *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*¹⁰ (1902).

its evidence fragments sufficient to fill only one moderate-sized volume. Additional and welcome light is given by the records of Assyria, Babylonia, Egypt, and Persia. This light, however, does not prove what it is sometimes claimed to prove ; it does not show that Israel was merely a part (and an insignificant part) of those great empires, and therefore that it has no history of its own. The political insignificance of Israel may be readily admitted. But the intellectual and spiritual life of Israel is a distinct entity, standing out apart from the life of the surrounding nations. This life which has made so distinct a contribution to civilisation must be understood from its own monuments, and can be understood from this source alone. It can be so understood, and the paucity of the remains which have come down to us should not discourage us. Critical inquirers have sometimes fallen into an exaggerated scepticism, as though nothing could be certainly known concerning antiquity—was not the theory once propounded that all the Greek and Latin texts in our hands were forgeries of the monks in the Middle Age? But such scepticism is unwarranted ; the documents in our hands, fragmentary though they be, are facts, and it ought to be possible to interpret their testimony. The footprint in the sand on Robinson Crusoe's island was a fragmentary monument indeed, but it gave evidence that was unmistakable, and it gave its interpreter many an uneasy hour because of the distinctness of its message.

It is evident that no one man can perform all the labor of criticism and at the same time carry on all the lines of investigation, archæological, geographical, and chronological. The worker in this field is one out of many, each one of whom is eager to make use of the results already obtained in order to make further discoveries. The constructive worker is engaged in a process of selection ; he must constantly ask himself which of the so-called results is reliably established, which is only probable, which is too uncertain to build upon. The first requisite of the historian, therefore, is soundness of judgment. It is, indeed, impossible to get along without hypotheses—our science is in line with other

sciences in this respect. But hypotheses differ widely among themselves. The ability to judge them soberly is of the first importance.

The ideal historian, therefore (in my judgment), is the one who is able to distinguish degrees of probability. To this must be added the ability to tell what he knows. What the specialist knows, his readers have a right to know. They have a right to see the picture which he sees, and to see it in the way in which he sees it. It has already become clear to us that a historical picture is made up of probabilities. Some of these probabilities stand out with a distinctness which is practical certainty. That David reigned over Israel, that Isaiah preached in Jerusalem, that Judas Maccabeus fought against the Gentiles—these are things which I can affirm with as little reserve as I affirm that twice two is four. I have the right and it is my duty, in making a historical picture, to draw these figures upon my canvas as firmly and distinctly as I can draw them. But as we fill in the picture, we are conscious that many details must be less sharply outlined; some are in the shadow so deeply that we barely make them out. The successful historian I take to be the one who is able to reproduce the lights and shadows so that his readers will be able to see the picture just as he sees it. To do this without the monotonous and irritating repetition of “perhaps,” “probably,” or “it seems to me,” is a matter of no little difficulty. Happy is the man who is able to feel that he has solved the problem with even a moderate degree of success.

The interest in history is as old as the Bible itself, as old as the oldest parts of the Bible, in fact. For we find among the earliest documents in Hebrew literature the songs and stories which rehearse the righteous acts of Yahweh, or which celebrate the deeds of Israel's heroes. We must not confound this interest in history with the interest felt by the modern student. Interest in history as history is a matter of comparatively recent growth. The earliest authors or singers were under the influence of patriotic or religious enthusiasm. And yet it does not seem forced

when we say that the ancient and the modern motives are not far apart. The ancient writer was sure that he was setting forth God's working for His people; the modern historian sets forth what has taken place in the hope of discovering the law of human progress. The latter is broader and more philosophical in his views; the former is more distinctly didactic in his tone. But the underlying motives are not very different. The narrative which was compiled from Israel's folk-stories, and which now fills the first section of our Old Testament, shows a genuine historic and philosophic interest. It is interesting to note even in the Bible itself the tendency to rewrite history to meet the views of succeeding generations; for the narrative of the earlier books was recast by the Chronicler to meet the needs of his own time. If criticism needed any justification it would find it in this precedent.

The first attempt to write a history of Israel, made in post-Biblical times, was that of Josephus in his *Antiquities*. This author was, no doubt, moved by a desire to emulate the Greek and Latin historians with whose works he had become acquainted during his years of residence at Rome. But with this personal ambition there was a concurrent motive. The proud Jew was stung by the taunts levelled at his race by the anti-Semites of that day. He would answer them by showing that the career of Israel was no whit inferior in interest and importance to that of any other nation of antiquity. Josephus was not alone in this ambition. Justus of Tiberias, a contemporary of his, had the same ambition and wrote a history of the Hebrew kings from Moses to Agrippa. He was less fortunate than his rival, for his work early fell into oblivion.¹

The Christian Church received the Old Testament from the Jews, first of all, as containing a divine revelation, and therefore as profitable for instruction in righteousness. It was for this rea-

¹ The most complete bibliography of Josephus, with a characterisation of the man and of his different works, is that of Schürer, *Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes* (1901), I, pp. 74-106. On Justus of Tiberias, *ibid.*, pp. 58-63

son, and not with any distinctly historical interest, that these books were read in the public assemblies as well as studied in private. Still there was a vague notion of historic progress in the Christian distinction between the old dispensation and the new. We are not surprised to find a New Testament writer contrasting the partial and fragmentary revelation of God in the prophets with the full revelation in Christ, and we recognise a real though rudimentary historic sense in such a contrast. But in the first centuries the historic interest was crowded out by others more pressing. On the one hand, the allegorical interpretation, already in vogue among the Jews, led to the search for mystical or theosophic revelations, and clouded the real historic meaning of the text. On the other hand, the attack made upon the Church by Jew and Gentile brought apologetics to the front, and emphasised philosophy rather than history.

Still the apologetic need resulted after a time in turning attention to history. The Greeks and Romans had their histories which were seen not to be in harmony with the scheme presented in the Biblical books. There was laid upon Christian writers much the same necessity which had been felt by Josephus ; they were challenged to reconcile the Scripture account of antiquity with those current among the Gentiles. They felt that they must, if possible, show the superiority of the sacred books. Julius Africanus is said first to have given attention to this matter. The result was his *Chronographia*, in which the Hebrew data were combined with those of Gentile writers. This work has been described as a handbook of universal history on the basis of the Biblical narrative. It has perished, except fragments, but it was the model after which many histories of the world were shaped, and the fashion has continued almost down to our own time.¹ Among the followers of Julius Africanus, the most important is Eusebius of Cæsarea, who wrote a book entitled *Chronica*. This work avows its apologetic purpose on its first page.

¹ Details may be read in Wachsmuth, *Einleitung in das Studium der alten Geschichte* (1895), pp. 155-158.

It gives parallel accounts of the history of the early ages, the Hebrew narrative (in outline) forming one section. The second part of the work is taken up with a chronological table, beginning with the time of Abraham. The author knows of the divergences between the Hebrew and Greek copies of the Penta-teuch and decides in favour of the Greek.¹

About the year 400 of our era, a compendious history of the world was written by Sulpicius Severus of Gaul.² Although continued down to the author's own times, this work might almost be called the first Biblical history. More than three-fourths of it are concerned with the Old Testament. The author dates the creation six thousand years before his own time, and follows closely the narrative of the Biblical books. His work is said to have been used as a text-book for the higher institutions of learning in the Netherlands, Germany, and France, as late as the seventeenth century. The sketch of Old Testament history given by Augustine, which may be mentioned in connexion with the work of Sulpicius, is a theological rather than a historical discussion.³ And, as is well known, Augustine was the leader of the Church for many generations. Mediæval study of the Scriptures was not carried on to learn history but to discover sound doctrine—that is, to justify the teaching of the Church and its institutions. Where the allegorical method prevails a real historical interest cannot assert itself. While the allegorical method succeeded in confirming the theology of the Schoolmen, the literal interpretation of the Old Testament was admitted so far as it

¹ The work has survived in an Armenian translation; the second book also in the Latin translation of Jerome. A Latin version made from the Armenian (by Petermann) was published together with some Greek fragments and the Latin of Jerome, by Schoene, *Eusebii Chronicorum Libri Duo* (1875). Cf. also the same author's critical discussion, *Die Weltchronik des Eusebius* (1900).

² *Sulpicii Severi Chronicorum Libri Duo* in the *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* (Vienna, 1866).

³ *De Civitate Dei*, XV–XVIII. The narrative is frequently interrupted by metaphysical disquisitions as well as by allegorical "improvements."

confirmed the rights and prerogatives of the ecclesiastical orders. We should be wrong to suppose that the only motives for study of the Scripture were these: the Church always more or less distinctly realised that it was called to teach. The Old Testament always had an immense practical interest; it furnished texts, examples, and illustrations for the preacher. But we can hardly discover in either of these methods of treatment a really historical interest.

The Reformation emphasised the importance of the Scriptures as the sole authority in doctrine, and it discarded the allegorical interpretation. It revived the Pauline contrast of Law and Gospel, and to this extent quickened the historic sense. But the study of Scripture as authority still interfered with its study as a source of history, though the emphasis laid upon the literal sense contributed in the long run to a better historical apprehension.

The full force of the Protestant position was felt in the seventeenth century, when in conjunction with a renewed activity in all departments of literature the Bible received more exact and careful attention. The names of Cappel and Morin in textual criticism, of Hobbes, Spinoza, and Richard Simon in the higher criticism, belong in this century.¹ With this critical activity we find more attention given to Biblical history, which, however, is still treated as the introductory part of Church history. Of the seriousness with which the problems were attacked we have an evidence in Usher's discussion of Biblical chronology, as well as in his *Annals*.² The latter work reproduces the data of the Biblical narrative in the order of time, beginning with the creation of the world "the evening before October 23 in the year 710 of the Julian Period," 4004 B.C. Each event is dated

¹ See the chapters on the higher criticism and on the history of Biblical History in Briggs, *General Introduction to the Study of Holy Scripture*.

² *Annales Veteris Testamenti a prima Mundi Origine deducti una cum rerum Asiaticarum und Ægypticarum Chronico*, London, 1650, reprinted in the collected edition of his works (1847). The *Chronologia Sacra* may be found in volumes XI and XII of the same edition.

from this era of the creation. Thus the Deluge began in the year 1656, Abraham was born 2008. The history of the world is divided into seven periods, of which six had elapsed at the birth of Christ. The author's theological interest is seen in his introduction of New Testament statements, like the one in which Paul says (following Rabbinical tradition) that the rock from which water flowed in Horeb *followed* the people in their wanderings; another example is the declaration that Joshua is a type of Christ and Canaan the type of the heavenly fatherland. In general, however, allegory is avoided.

The historical interest of this work is seen in the introduction of Egyptian, Babylon, and other Gentile kings in their supposed proper place in the narrative. Thus, after the account of the exodus of Israel, we have Manetho's story of Egypt under Sesothis (Sesostris); in the year 2737 A.M. we have the statement of Herodotus concerning Ninus, the founder of the Assyrian empire. These citations from Gentile sources become more numerous later in the narrative, so that the work may be said, like the earlier ones already described, to give us universal history in a Biblical framework. But it does this on the basis of a fresh study of the sources.

The work of Usher, was, perhaps, the most important on this subject published between the Reformation and the year 1750. Others are mentioned by the bibliographers, some of which were sketches of Biblical history introductory to the history of the Church, others were theological and speculative rather than historical. As an example of the former class may be cited Spanheim's introduction to chronology and sacred history; an example of the latter is Heidegger's "History of the Patriarchs."¹ The next century saw the "Connexion" of Prideaux, which treated an important period of Old Testament history, and which still

¹ Spanheim, *Introductio ad Chronologiam et Historiam Sacram* (1694); Heidegger, *De Historia Sacra Patriarcharum* (1667). Other works of this period are catalogued by Diestel, *Geschichte des Alten Testaments in der Christlichen Kirche* (1869), pp. 460-464.

has value. The same year with Prideaux's work was published on the continent an "Ecclesiastical History of the Old Testament," by Buddeus, a well-known theologian.¹ As the century advanced, the Deistic controversy gave occasion to re-examine many questions in Biblical history, though here again the purpose was primarily apologetic or polemic.²

The modern period of Old Testament study may be said to date from Astruc's "Conjectures," published in 1753. The preceding literature may be described by the term theological, on the Deistic as well as on the orthodox side. Astruc marked an epoch (isolated forerunners have already been mentioned), because he turned attention afresh to the phenomena of the Bible itself, and showed how many of these had escaped attention. For the time being, this caused men to neglect Biblical history, for the critical process became all absorbing. At the same time philosophical and theological discussion became more active. French scepticism (Voltaire is the best example) on one side, and a new philosophy (Kant) on the other, gave the defenders of tradition all they could do. The result was to make the time a period of confusion and strife. But through the welter a more correct apprehension of the Old Testament gradually worked its way to the front. Eichhorn is the best example of real critical advance, while Herder pointed the way to a more sympathetic construction of Biblical history.³

¹ Prideaux, *A Historical Connexion of the Old and New Testaments* (1715). The work was primarily intended to cover the (supposed) period between the Old and New Testaments, but begins with the time of Ahaz. It suggested the less important work of Shuckford, *The Sacred and Profane History of the World Connected* (1727) which extends from the creation to the exodus. Buddeus, *Historia Ecclesiastica Veteris Testamenti* (1715) has gone through several editions.

² Although published a little later than the period we are discussing, I may mention here the most elaborate refutation of the Deistic objections to revelation: Lilienthal, *Gute Sache der Göttlichen Offenbarung* (1760-1782) in sixteen volumes.

³ Eichhorn, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, 1780-83; the fourth edi-

In the nineteenth century the progress of our science is marked by two great names—Ewald and Wellhausen. Ewald's chief work¹ contains an elaborate criticism of the sources, as well as a narrative of events and movements. At the very outset the author emphasises the necessity of distinguishing the story from its foundation, that is, of criticising the sources. Ewald's learning and acuteness are unquestioned. His work sometimes repels by its dogmatism, and, as we now know, its theory of the documents is wrong. But, all things considered, it is one of the most influential works which the last century produced. Its results were popularised in England and America by Dean Stanley's lectures on the history of the Jewish Church.² Other histories by German scholars in this period are either based on critical hypotheses similar to those of Ewald, or else are anticritical in their bias. Among the former may be mentioned Hitzig and Weber, as well as the early volumes of Grätz.³ Among the latter we may reckon Hengstenberg, Kurtz, and Köhler.⁴ Eng-
tion appeared in 1823. Herder, *Aelteste Urkunde des Menschengeschlechts* (1774); *Geist der Hebräischen Poesie* (1782). Cf. Briggs, *General Introduction to the Study of Holy Scripture* (1899), chapter XI, *Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch* (1897), chapters III–VI.

¹ *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, 7 vols., 1843 ff. The third edition appeared 1864–1868. An English translation of this edition was published 1869–1883. The Old Testament History ends with Vol. IV of the German, Vol. V of the English; the remaining volumes treat of New Testament times.

² *History of the Jewish Church*, 3 vols., 1863–1877.

³ Hitzig, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, 1869; Weber und Holtzmann, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel und des Entstehung des Christentums*, 2 vols., 1867; Grätz, *Geschichte der Juden*, vols. 1–3, 1874.

⁴ Hengstenberg, *Geschichte des Reiches Gottes unter dem alten Bunde*, 1870; Kurtz, *Geschichte des Alten Bundes*, 1848–1858; English translation under the title, *History of the Old Covenant*, 1859. The work extends only to the exodus. Köhler's book, *Biblische Geschichte des Alten Testaments* (1875–1893), is valuable for its full bibliography. The author, though conservative in his predilections, was compelled, by his sense of fairness, to make considerable concessions to the critics in the course of his work. Other works are cited in Zückler, *Handbuch der Theologischen Wissenschaften* (1883), I, p. 263 f.

lish Biblical scholarship was until recently almost wholly anti-critical. Proof may be found in the works of William Smith, Milman, and Edersheim.¹

A distinct epoch is marked by the publication of Wellhausen's *Prolegomena*.² The views there advanced were not altogether new. Reuss had held (but not published) them as early as 1834, while Graf and Kuenen had come independently to the same conclusions. But the brilliancy of Wellhausen's style, and the skill with which he marshalled his arguments, first showed the strength of the position which he maintained. This position was that the Law was not the starting-point but the culmination of Israel's development. The rapidity with which this thesis was accepted by Old Testament scholars was nothing less than revolutionary. Among English-speaking peoples the theory of Wellhausen was set forth by his article "Israel" in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, and by the lectures of W. Robertson Smith on the Old Testament in the Jewish Church,³ and on the Prophets of Israel. From the Wellhausenian point of view a number of histories of Israel have been published within the last twenty-five years, as well as a larger number of monographs dealing with particular epochs or with details of the critical inquiry. The following list is not absolutely complete, but contains the most important of the histories:

Wellhausen himself has published an *Israelitische und Judische Geschichte* which may be supposed to represent the second vol-

¹ William Smith, *Student's Old Testament History*; Milman, *History of the Jews*, 3 vols. (second edition, 1863); Edersheim, *History of Israel and Judah*, 7 vols. (1887).

² The original title was *Geschichte Israels, Band I* (1878). The later editions bear the title, *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*. The work is published in an English translation in a volume (which contains also Wellhausen's article, "Israel," from the *Encyclopædia Britannica*), entitled *Prolegomena to the History of Israel* (no date).

³ First delivered in Edinburgh and Glasgow in 1881 and published the same year; second edition, 1892. *The Prophets of Israel* followed in 1882; second edition, 1897.

ume of the work of which the *Prolegomena* was the first. This volume appeared in 1894, and has passed through several editions.

Stade, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, 1881-1888. The latter part of the history was written by Oskar Holtzmann. Next to Wellhausen's works this is the most important treatise which has yet appeared on the subject. It is enriched with maps, plans, fac-similes, and illustrations.

Kuenen's works on the Religion of Israel and on the Prophets are in the domain of Biblical theology, but their historical bearings are important.

Reuss, *Geschichte der Heiligen Schriften alten Testaments* (1881) is nominally a history of the literature. In fact, it treats the history of the people and the history of the literature together in a suggestive and attractive manner.

Renan, *Histoire du Peuple d'Israel*, 1887-1893; English translation 1888-1895. Renan's brilliancy of style is well known. His critical point of view is nearer that of Ewald than that of Wellhausen.

Kittel, *Geschichte der Hebräer*, 1888-1892. English translation, *History of the Hebrews*, 2 vols., 1895. This history extends to the capture of Jerusalem by Nebuchadrezzar. The author gives a considerable part of his attention to the discussion of critical questions, in which he agrees more nearly with Dillmann than with Wellhausen.

Vernes, *Précis d'Histoire Juive*, 1889. The author gives a good sketch of Hebrew history, but expresses an exaggerated scepticism concerning the sources from which he draws.

Winckler, *Geschichte Israels*, 2 vols., 1895 and 1900. The work is less a history of Israel than a series of ingenious conjectures on various points in the early history.

Klostermann, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel bis zur Restauration unter Esra und Nehemia*, 1896. The author is known as one of the ablest among the (comparatively) conservative scholars in Germany.

Kent, *History of the Hebrew People and History of the Jewish People*, 4 vols., 1896-1900. The last volume is by Professor Riggs. The work is based upon a critical appreciation of the sources and is enriched by maps and chronological tables.

Thomas, *Geschichte des Alten Bundes*, 1897. This is a work intended especially for teachers, and is written by one who is not *ex professo* an Old Testament scholar. The author is, however, thoroughly familiar with the best critical literature, and succeeds in presenting the history of Israel in connexion with that of Egypt and the great Asiatic empires. The work extends to the fall of Jerusalem, A.D. 70.

Piepenbring, *Histoire du Peuple d'Israel*, 1898. This is the best presentation in French of the Wellhausenian reconstruction of the history of Israel.

Cornill, *History of the People of Israel*, 1898. This is a series of ten papers prepared for the *Open Court* (Chicago). It is published also in German.

Guthe, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, 1899. The English reader will form a good idea of the author's position by examining his article "Israel" in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, II.

Löhr, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, 1900—an outline in eight lectures.

Paton, *The Early History of Syria and Palestine*, 1901. Though not strictly an Old Testament History, this book discusses helpfully many questions which belong in our department.

Ottley, *A Short History of the Hebrews to the Roman Period*, 1901. Maps, a brief sketch of critical positions, and a chronological table add to the usefulness of this volume.

Wade, *Old Testament History* (1901). The usefulness of this book is sufficiently evidenced by the fact that a second edition has just appeared (1903). It modestly claims that it is not intended for scholars, "but for less advanced students." It is, however, thoroughly critical in its positions and method.

The reader will not fail to note that the long silence of English scholarship in the department of Old Testament History has

now been broken, and that the critical position is fairly established.

With reference to the present work I have two remarks to make. The first is that for Hebrew proper names I have retained the form familiar to us in the English of the authorised version. The only exception is the divine name *Yahweh*, which seems to me in every way preferable to the un-Hebraic *Jehovah*.

My second remark concerns the literature of the subject. All branches of Old Testament science bear upon Old Testament history, and there is no book in any department which may not have something of value for the historian. It is plain that no one man can be familiar with this vast body of literature. My hope is that I have overlooked no work of real importance.

In making references I have not usually taken into consideration other works on Old Testament History. The reader who wishes to study the subject thoroughly will consult the most important of these. Where I have made references I have made them to works which treat some particular phase of the subject, or which will enable the reader to discover the grounds of that interpretation of a Biblical text which I have adopted.

The current method of abbreviating titles (seen in the frequent recurrence of such enigmas as P R E, S B A W, Z D M G) must be annoying to the reader who is not familiar with the literature. Even one who has some experience is frequently at a loss to interpret these symbols and is obliged to waste his time in consulting a table of abbreviations. However appropriate for an encyclopædia such a system may be, I am convinced that for a work like the one before us the trifling amount of space saved should not be brought into the account against the convenience of the reader. I have therefore followed the example of Schürer, and in each case have given the title of the work which I cite with sufficient fulness to enable the reader to identify it at once.

My colleague, Prof. John F. Genung, has read a considerable part of this work in manuscript; my friend, Prof. Irving F. Wood, of Smith College, has read the whole work in proof;

and my son, Preserved Smith, Fellow of Columbia University, has also read a considerable part of it in proof. I am indebted to all these gentlemen for helpful suggestions, and it gives me pleasure here to express my thanks.

AMHERST, MASS., *July 28, 1903.*

OLD TESTAMENT HISTORY

CHAPTER I

THE SOURCES

THE name *Old Testament History* is an inheritance from early theological science. All history was allowed to fall into the two divisions designated as *Sacred* and *Profane*. The former readily divided itself into the Biblical and Ecclesiastical sections, and the Biblical section as readily arranged itself under the heads Old Testament and New Testament. Of late years the distinction between sacred and secular has become less marked. It is now felt that all history is sacred, because it is all the working out of the plan of God. What has been known as Old Testament History now begins to appear under the title History of Israel.

Whichever name we use, the discipline itself is of the first importance to every one who would understand the world or his own time. The little land of Palestine has had large influence upon the progress of mankind. The story of the people who dwelt there is more widely known than anything else that has come down to us from ancient times. In modern Europe, in America, among all nations that profess the Christian religion the names of Abraham, Moses, and David are household words. The same is true in Mohammedan countries. Israel has contributed to our civilisation the enduring and powerful element of religion. The literature of Israel has become a part of the Bible, and the Bible is the book of religion for the civilised world. But a literature cannot be understood without a knowledge of the people which gave it birth. The importance of a study of the history of Israel needs no further demonstration.¹

¹ On the place of Old Testament History among the theological sciences cf. Briggs, *General Introduction to the Study of Holy Scripture*, 1899, pp. 37, 487 ff.

In entering upon this study we are at once confronted by the fact that a large part of the Old Testament itself is historical in form. It would seem at first sight as if the historian had only to adopt what the sacred writers have already written down, telling their story after them. The endeavour to do this would be at once hampered however by the fact that there is not one history to deal with, but that there are two. The books from Genesis to II Kings give an apparently continuous narrative from the Creation to the Exile. The Books of Chronicles, with their continuation in Ezra and Nehemiah, begin at the same point and carry the story beyond the return from the Exile. Older scholars supposed it possible—indeed they were forced by their view of inspiration—to combine these two narratives in such a way as to retain all the data of both. It is now generally recognised that such a combination is impossible. The two histories present so many points of divergence that they can in no way be made to give a homogeneous account.

But a further difficulty arises when the attempt is made to do justice not only to these two histories but also to the rest of the literature which has come down to us from Hebrew antiquity. An important part of this literature preserves to us the works of the prophets. These preachers of righteousness have left on record their impressions of their own times, and have thus given us great light upon the history. It becomes necessary to make use of these documents along with those which are narrative in form. The same is true of the poetical and apocalyptic sections of the Old Testament. All are monuments of an historic process, and should fit into a connected whole.

A successful presentation of this historic process is therefore dependent upon historical criticism. This science distinguishes the documents, analyses them if compound, shows their true nature, dates them, and leads to a correct estimate of their historic content. Old Testament history is therefore directly dependent upon the higher criticism of the Old Testament. The conclusions reached by the critic are the starting-point of the historian.¹

¹ The higher criticism of the Old Testament is thoroughly treated in Driver, *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*,⁶ 1897. Compare also Briggs, *General Introduction*, Chapters XI and XII; Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, translated by Black and Menzies, Edinburgh, no date (the third edition of the German is dated 1886).

Critical study of the Old Testament books has made two things plainly, even startlingly, evident. The first is that scarcely one of these books can claim to be a homogeneous production. The most of them are made up by a process of compilation out of previously existing material. This is known to be characteristic of large parts of ancient literature. The Arab historians and commentators freely excerpt what they please to take from their predecessors. Josephus in his history borrows in the same way both from documents now in our hands and from others that have perished. Within the bounds of a single book of the Old Testament we must expect to find a variety of material, and we must learn to discriminate that which has the greater historical value. It will be evident that where an author has imbedded older material in his work, the older material may have a value quite different from that which he has given it. The very recognition of different strata in an historical book implies that some parts are more reliable than others. The historian must get as near as he can to contemporary accounts. In the inquiry as to what actually took place at a given time, the most ancient testimony deserves the first attention.

But besides the composite nature of the documents we must recognise another fact. The books of the Old Testament—even those which are historical in form—are not historical in the sense in which we use the word. The first aim of the authors was not to set forth the actual course of events, but to set the events in such a light as to point a moral. The books of the Old Testament are books of devotion, or books of edification ; the purpose of the authors is didactic and hortative. It is in human nature to make sermons effective by painting their illustrations in vivid colours. And the colours which most distinctly affect us are those drawn from our own experience. To modernise the incidents which we draw from ancient history is almost necessary if we are to make our story profitable to our own times. Unconsciously but powerfully moved by this fact, the Hebrew historians used great freedom in treating the material which was in their possession.

It may not be out of place to illustrate this tendency somewhat in detail. As has already been remarked, we have two narrative sections of the Old Testament which cover the same ground, one in the Books of Kings, the other in the Books of Chronicles. We

cannot help asking ourselves why the Chronicler should rewrite the history of his people. Why should he not content himself with reading, copying, and circulating what had come down from the fathers? The plain answer to these questions is that he did not find the older history edifying. For one thing, there was much in it that was to him superfluous. He had no interest in that backsliding Kingdom of Israel, to which so much space was given in the older narrative. In addition he was scandalised by much that was there set forth. Why should people care to dwell upon such unpleasant things as David's adultery and the rebellion of his sons? It would be better (he thought) to draw the veil of charity over the faults and misfortunes of Israel's great king. It would be more edifying to have the history without these shadows. And so the good man rewrote it without the shadows. He had no idea of casting doubt upon the older story, only he wanted a more edifying presentation. His omissions are thus easily accounted for.

It is equally easy to account for the insertions. The Chronicler lived in a time when the Priest-code¹ had become fully established as the law of the people. Now the peculiarity of the Priest-code is that it carries an elaborate ritual back to the times of Moses. The Chronicler adopted this view with all his heart. To him the whole ritual establishment had been organised in connexion with the Tabernacle and had come with Israel into the promised land. But if this were so the question arose: What became of it? The older historical books are evidently silent concerning it. This might be accounted for in the period of the Judges and in the period of Saul. Those were times of declension and of disintegration. But even when we come to David we find the same oppressive silence. The older narrative knows of only two priests at David's court, and ignores the Levites altogether. When David flees before Absalom, Zadok and Abiathar themselves bring the Ark to David. Where was the great corps of Levites which ought to have borne the Ark and accompanied it as a guard of honour? This question was only one of many similar ones that the Chronicler presumably asked himself.² His

¹ On this document compare Driver, *Introduction*, pp. 126-159.

² The statements that David's sons were priests and that Ira the Jairite was a priest (II Sam. 8¹⁸, 20²⁵) do not substantially relieve the difficulty felt by the Chronicler; they would rather increase his perplexity.

reply was to the effect that the older narrative, whatever its excellencies, was gravely deficient in many points. He therefore set to work to make it more complete, and this he did with a thoroughness that commands our admiration. No sooner does his narrative bring the Ark to its new home in Jerusalem than he supplies it with an elaborate household, as we may fairly judge from the sixty-eight doorkeepers¹ whose number is expressly given. A few years later we find David gathering the Levites together, and their number is given at thirty-eight thousand—all of them mature men, qualified for the service of the sanctuary. David proceeds at this time to organise them more completely, but it is evidently the mind of the author that they were already members of the sacred caste which had been set apart by Moses. Instead of the two priests of David's court we now find the house of Aaron numbering nearly four thousand adult males² and organised in twenty-four courses, only one of which is in service at any one time. The deficiencies of the earlier document have been thoroughly supplied. Along with this, too, the desire to find in David a nursing father for the visible church is gratified by making him the reorganiser of the service and the founder of the music of the Temple.

In the matter of the priesthood therefore we understand the motive of the Chronicler; at the same time we discover that his work must not be called history. We shall do him wrong if we suppose him to be alone in his peculiar views. There is no doubt that he represents the whole tendency of his own time, and that the way had been prepared for him by a whole school of tradition. Not only the religion of the time was casting a glamour over the past; its patriotism was equally concerned. As the horizon of the Jews had widened when brought into the Persian and Greek periods their view of Israel's ancient history became exaggerated. David and Solomon, the heroes of the past, were now measured by the standards of Xerxes or Alexander. Their wealth becomes comparable to the wealth of Babylon. In rewriting the history of these Kings, therefore, the Chronicler finds the earlier data altogether too modest. When David gathered the warriors of Israel together, according to the earlier history, he found them to be thirty thousand in number. But when the

¹ I Chr. 16³⁸; notice also the choir of Levites already present, vv. 4-7.

² According to I Chr. 12²⁷ there are 3,700 who came to David at Hebron.

Chronicler brings the bands of fighting men to David at Hebron, before his coronation, there are more than three hundred thousand.¹ The author is equally lavish in other instances of numbers, proving again that his narrative must not be called history. In fact it must be classed with the Jewish literature which we call Midrash.²

The Midrash is a recognised form of later Jewish literature, which has arisen from the tendency we are considering—the tendency of the religious mind to modify historical material so as to make it serve for present edification. Examples of it are found in the pseudepigraphical books, as for example the Book of Jubilees. In this book the material of the canonical Genesis is rewritten to suit the taste of the times—the first century before Christ. Here the Mosaic institutions are antedated, because the devotees of the Law could not suppose that Abraham did not live by the most perfect rule of life. The freedom with which Josephus and Philo fill out the Biblical biographies is an example of the same tendency; and indeed modern sermons are in no wise slow to paint the lives of Abraham and Moses and David with colours drawn from legend or from the preacher's imagination. It is not without significance that the Chronicler names among his sources a Midrash of the prophet Iddo, and a Midrash of the Book of Kings.³ His whole book could not be better described than by the title *A Midrash of the Book of Kings*.

So strong is this tendency that it is discoverable in other parts of the Old Testament. The critical analysis of the earlier historical books shows that the authors of some of the documents were aiming to prove a thesis. The editor of Judges avows his

¹ I Chr. 12²³⁻³⁷. The total appears to be 340,600, besides 222 captains whose soldiers are not enumerated. The earlier account is II Sam. 6¹.

² The nature of the Book of Chronicles was first distinctly set forth by De Wette in his *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, I, Halle, 1806. Wellhausen makes a clear and convincing statement in his *Prolegomena*³, pp. 175-235; *History of Israel*, pp. 171-222. The reader may also consult Driver, *Introduction*⁶, pp. 516-554, and the articles in Hastings, *Dictionary of the Bible* (by Professor Francis Brown) and in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*.

³ II Chr. 13²², 24²⁷. On the subject of Midrash cf. Schürer, *Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes*³, II, pp. 327, 338-350; Zunz, *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge*² 1892, pp. 13, 37. Considerable portions of the later Jewish Midrash are translated by Wünsche, *Bibliotheca Rabbinica*, Leipzig, 1880, and later.

aim in the very distinct statement which he makes concerning the lesson of his history. The stories of the ancient heroes which he recites are fitted by him into a framework in which they did not originally belong, and in which some of them at least are made to teach a lesson wholly foreign to the intent of their original author. In the First Book of Samuel we have a particularly glaring instance of two contradictory points of view urged by different sections of the narrative. The older document made the anointing of Saul an act of grace, a manifestation of Yahweh's favour toward Israel. A later writer had a very different view of the monarchy and he enforced it by his version of the story. According to him the demand for a King was the act of an unruly and backslidden people. Samuel acceded to the demand only under protest, and the divine purpose was to punish the people by the very King whom they desire. This second account is a rewriting of the older one. All that is new in it is the point of view. Its interest is not in the history but in the moral it can be made to teach.¹ That the latest redactor of the Books of Kings has the same interest, is evident from the judgment which he so constantly pronounces on the men and events of which he writes.

It is necessary for the modern historian to make constant allowance for these tendencies. The result is undoubtedly a serious modification, and in many cases a reversal of the statements which the Biblical historians have made. This is not surprising. The authors who gave final form to the Biblical history were remote from the events which they described. They were under the impression of a powerful judgment of God in the destruction of Jerusalem and the exile of their people. It was inevitable that they should look upon the whole past of their nation as a perpetual backsliding. As we ourselves know, grave imperfections are seen in the civilisation of earlier ages, when it is measured by a modern standard. The Biblical writers easily saw the imperfections of their predecessors, and had not the breadth of view rightly to make allowance for them. Hence the pessimism of their histories, a pessimism that was exaggerated by

¹ The composite nature of these historical books is pointed out in the recent commentaries, that of Moore on *Judges*, my own on *Samuel* (both in the *International Critical Commentary*), and those in Marti *Kurzer Handkommentar*, and Nowack *Handkommentar*.

their view of a more remote past. For along with a severe judgment of our immediate ancestors there often goes a tendency to glorify those more remote. An American may in the same breath condemn the statesmen of the middle of the nineteenth century, while praising the revolutionary fathers in unstinted terms. So the sacred historian condemns the whole people from the time of the conquest down, while idealising the Patriarchs. In both respects it is necessary for us to make allowance for the point of view.

The extent to which this pessimistic tendency has taken possession of our minds as we look at the Biblical story can hardly be overstated. Although, according to one story, God created all things very good, the fall of man which follows effaces the primitive goodness and infects soil and man with a curse. The first age of the world ends in a corruption so universal that it must be wiped out by the Deluge. In the succeeding generations the character of Abraham alone is worthy of our respect. His pure and lofty monotheism passes on to Isaac and Jacob, though the family of Jacob already show signs of degeneracy. But Moses is sent to a stiff-necked people, as appears throughout the Exodus and the Wandering. A brief brightness shines in the career of Joshua. But as soon as he is gone the incorrigible depravity of the people comes into view. Each of the Judges is leader of a revival which comes after a period of deep and inexcusable backsliding. The establishment of the monarchy is only a glaring instance of the perversity of the people. David indeed redeems the institution from the curse under which we suspect it to labour. But after David the degeneracy again shows itself. The rebellion of the ten tribes, the preservation of the High-places, the political moves of the various monarchs—all teach the same lesson. The climax is reached in the fall of Jerusalem, which is God's final and emphatic curse on ages of rebellion.

The justification for the modern historian who modifies this picture or even contradicts it, is in the fact already mentioned that this is the view of the latest time, and that if we disentangle the documents some of them at least will tell a very different story. Whatever the total result, the serious historian will give all the documents the weight which belongs to them. The endeavour to harmonise them so that they will agree in the lesson they teach brings us at once into difficulty. If, as one document

affirms, David had a Teraphim (an idolatrous image) in his house, and if, as another document asserts, the law against idolatry was promulgated before the time of David, we are in a hopeless muddle ; for all the documents agree that David was obedient to the will of God. The difficulty is with the document which has antedated the giving of the law, and we should frankly recognise this. A parallel case in the life of Gideon will meet us in our later investigation.

The obvious lesson from what has been said is that the student must first concern himself with the history of tradition. He must clearly distinguish the different documents which have been wrought into the Biblical text, and be able to give each one its approximate date. The testimony of each one must then be taken for the period in which it belongs, for it is evident that its primary value is here. The Chronicler has no independent value for the history of David ; but for the history of his own generation his work is priceless. The success of the historian depends upon getting at what each author has to reveal concerning his own time. Nor is it necessary to lay much stress upon the **charge** that the historian in trying to date his documents is moved by an evolutionary bias. Progress there must be in all history, or it would not be history. It need not be difficult for the Old Testament historian to determine questions of early or late without being under a bias of any kind.¹

In the history of tradition we must include those books of the Old Testament which are not distinctively historical. How great importance these prophetic and poetical books have for the history of their times must be evident. But it is also evident that we cannot take them for what the Jewish editors supposed them to be until we have verified their claims. The various elements which go to make up the Book of Isaiah, for example, must be examined and dated before they are used for historical purposes. In such cases the historian works hand in hand with the literary critic, or freely avails himself of his predecessor's results.

¹ A thorough discussion of the tradition as a preliminary to a history of Israel was made by Ewald in his *Geschichte des Volkes Israel* (third edition in seven volumes, 1864-1868, English Translation, 6 vols., 1869-1883). Unfortunately Ewald was wrong in his theory of the order of the documents. His error was corrected by Wellhausen in his *Geschichte Israels*, I (later editions bear the title *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*). Notice also Winckler's statement in *Keilinschriften und Altes Testament*³, p. 208.

Having got at the history of tradition we may inquire for the facts which lie behind the tradition. In this inquiry we are often obliged to confess our ignorance. What actually happened at a given epoch is eternally concealed from us where (as is so often the case) the documents are lacking. Nevertheless we have reason to feel that the main outlines are reasonably clear. In the endeavour to trace them, we shall follow the course laid down by the Old Testament itself.

CHAPTER II

THE ORIGINS

THE Hebrew narrative books as they are now in our hands have a well-defined scheme of history. The Book of Genesis begins with the creation of the world, and gives a chronological outline of the first period, which ends with the Deluge. A fresh start is made with Noah, the second father of the race. In this period the whole race of mankind is grouped genealogically, and, as it appears, geographically; the three zones of the known world being assigned to the three sons of Noah and their descendants. Attention is then directed to Abraham, one of the descendants of Shem. This is because he is the father of the group of peoples to which Israel belongs. In the family of Abraham we are introduced to Ishmael and Isaac. But Ishmael is dismissed from the record with a mere genealogy, that we may devote ourselves to Isaac and his line. The two sons of Isaac are brought before us in the same way, and a genealogical account of the clans of Esau is given before they in turn are dismissed, that we may give exclusive attention to Jacob and his sons. These are the main subjects of the narrative, up to which the rest has skilfully led.

It is necessary for us to note however that this plan of history, which leaves nothing to be desired in point of completeness, is due to the latest of the authors who have been concerned in the composition of Genesis. These numbers and genealogies are the work of the Priestly author, who wrote certainly after the year 500 B.C. In accordance with the spirit of his time which delighted in genealogical tables—as we see abundantly illustrated in the Books of Chronicles written a little later—he brought the whole early history into tabular form. The divisions of his history are in fact entitled genealogies. Even the sketch of the Creation has the subscription “This is the Book of Genealogy of Heaven and Earth,”¹ and similar titles stand at the head of the other divisions of his work.

¹ A slight alteration of the received text is here accepted, as made by Ball, *The Book of Genesis*, in Haupt's *Sacred Books of the Old Testament* (1896).

On account of this formal and schematic character of the work of P¹, this work was made the basis of the composite book before us; for it is evident that two very different hands have been at work in the account of the Creation. The writer of the cold and dignified narrative in Genesis 1¹–2^{4a} could not have written the brilliant and imaginative sketch which runs through the second, third, and fourth chapters of the book. In this latter, which is evidently the more primitive account, Yahweh² is naïvely human. He experiments with His creation. He shapes man out of clay; then having given him life He forms the other animals to see whether they will be fit companions of man. Only when He sees that none of these meets the exigency does He fall upon the device of taking a part of the man himself to make into a woman. Furthermore, he plants a garden in the East, in which He Himself dwells. He places the man in it as His gardener to till it and to guard it. As He takes His evening walk there, He discovers man's guilt by his behaviour—of any exercise of omniscience there is no question. He expels man from the garden because he has become dangerously like a divine being. All this is very delightful and very primitive.

It does not seem venturesome to declare that this cosmology is different from the other in that it took its origin in the desert. It begins by declaring that in the day when Yahweh made heaven and earth, there was no bush of the field on the earth, and no grass had sprung up, because Yahweh had not rained on the earth, and there was no man to till the ground. In the desert, herbage springs up after the rain, and the tilled ground is ground that has been reclaimed from the waste by the man who carefully husband its water-supply. This is in contrast with the other

¹ So we will designate the Priestly writer, in accordance with now common usage. The other writers of the Hexateuch are J (the Yahwist, from his use of the divine name *Yahweh*), E (the Elohist, from his preference for *Elohim* as the name of God), and D (the author of Deuteronomy). As J shows a marked interest in the history of Judah he is sometimes called the *Judaic* writer, and E, by contrast, is the *Ephraimitic*. A very full discussion of the nature of the documents is given by Carpenter and Battersby, *The Hexateuch* I, 1900; cf. also Briggs, *Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch*, 1897.

² It seems better to use this, which is the Hebrew name for God, than to take a more general and less definite word. The orthography is intended to represent what was probably the original pronunciation. See the new Hebrew Lexicon B D B, *sub voce*.

conception, according to which the primeval chaos was the primeval ocean, or the primeval mud, from which the water must be drained into the great subterranean reservoir before the dry land could appear.

The creation story of the Yahwist cannot be correctly estimated without considering the other legendary or mythological material of his narrative. Leaving out of view the Deluge, which possibly did not belong in the earliest form of J, we may look at his story of the Confusion of Tongues. Here we see clearly that he has the intention to account for the present state of mankind in contrast with a primitive state which was quite different. If all our race be descended from a single pair, how do they come to speak so many languages? This is a question which was forced upon him by what he saw of the actual condition of mankind. And in answering this question he used the story of a tower and an etymology, neither of which originally had any connexion with what they now set forth.¹ Our author is a philosopher; he is interested in accounting for the present state of things. This story accounts for the awkward variety of languages spoken by mankind. The Deity devised it to check the too great power of mankind. Now we understand the earlier narrative. Precisely as the story of the Confusion accounts for the present variety of speech, so does the story of the Fall account for the present toilsome lot of the labourer. The toil of the peasant is far more exacting than we should expect for the man who was created to keep the garden of Yahweh. The earth, as we now see it, has a constant tendency to thorns and briers. This must be because Yahweh was obliged to keep man in check. He had aspired too high, had almost become like God. Equally strange with the ceaseless toil of man is the painful parturition of woman when compared with the easy travail of the animals. It was an ingenious speculation which solved both these problems and at the same time accounted for the anomalous life of the serpent, by the story of the temptation and fall of man.

This same account gives us a glimpse into primitive mythology by its treatment of the serpent as one of the characters in the drama. We have no difficulty in recognising in him some-

¹ It is scarcely necessary to remark that our appreciation of the author is not affected by his etymology of the name Babel—an etymology which is impossible. The passage is Gen. 11 1-9.

thing more than an animal. But the reason is that to the writer all animals were something more than animals as we view them. To primitive man—to man far beyond the primitive stage in fact—all animals have something demonic about them. Not that the serpent is the fallen angel of Milton's poem, or the Satan of the New Testament. He is simply a *jinnée*, a fairy if you will, possessed of more knowledge than the other animals, but otherwise like them. Diabolical envy or malice cannot be ascribed to him. He counsels man to eat of the fruit *bona fide*, because he knows that man will be raised toward the life of the gods by eating. He has not wit enough to foresee that Yahweh will resent the invasion of His prerogatives, nor has he strength or cunning to resist the sentence pronounced upon him for his meddling.¹

The material which J embodied in his narrative is properly described by the term mythological. If this is not evident from what has been said it will come into view when we consider a section which we have not yet studied. This is the account of the marriage of the Sons of God with the daughters of men.²

The little section reads as follows:

"And when men began to multiply on the earth and daughters were born to them, the Sons of God saw that the daughters of men were fair, and they took to themselves wives of all whom they chose. Then Yahweh said, My spirit shall not continue in man forever on account of their erring. He is flesh, and his days shall be a hundred and twenty years."

In considering this obscure passage some things are not obscure. The first is that the Sons of God, which are mentioned in such distinct contrast with the daughters of men, must be beings of another order. When *men* began to multiply then the *angels* were enticed—this is the only proper antithesis. And with this interpretation agrees Biblical usage in the few cases in which the Sons of God are mentioned.³ There is no other way in

¹ The character of the serpent as a demonic being is sufficiently evident in the most diverse mythologies. The brazen serpent worshipped at Jerusalem till the time of Hezekiah is evidence for the view of the Hebrews, II Kings 18⁴.

² Gen. 6¹⁻⁴. The paragraph presents palpable difficulties to the translator, and has been the subject of almost endless discussion. The student may read with profit Budde, *Die Biblische Urgeschichte* (1883), and in opposition to some of Budde's positions Gruppe, in the *Zeitschrift für die Alttest. Wissenschaft*, 1889, p. 135 ff.; among the commentaries Dillmann (Eng. Transl. 1897) gives a good view of the state of the inquiry.

³ Job, 1⁶, 2¹, 38⁷; cf. Ps. 29¹, 89⁷⁽⁶⁾ and Dan. 3²⁵.

which we can do justice to this passage with its use of the generic word *man*. It follows that we have here to do with the marriage of the jinn (to use the Arab word once more) with human beings. So the passage was interpreted by later Judaism and by the early Christians,¹ whose fully developed angelology was able to make use of it to account for the origin of sin. Our author has a less definite conception of the superhuman beings concerned in the transaction than had the Fathers of the Church, but that they are superhuman and in the class to which Yahweh belongs, seems quite clear.

The difference between this early writer and the later ones to which I have alluded, is that he knows nothing of a condemnation of the angels. He does not call their conduct sinful. Nor indeed does he condemn the human beings involved. All that we discover in his account is that Yahweh is displeased. And the reason that Yahweh is displeased is that by the conduct of the angels His spirit is brought into human bodies. This implies a dangerous increase in the power of mankind. The danger is met by the decree that the duration of man upon earth shall be comparatively brief. It is the prevention of immortality which is the chief concern, as was the case in setting a guard over the tree of life.

In similar stories in other mythologies we find an assault made by the inferior gods upon the throne of the Creator. It is natural to suppose that something of the kind was in the original from which our author drew, because he takes pains to bring in a reference to the giants, offspring of the celestial marriages. On the other hand, the absence of any condemnation of the angels argues against such a supposition. The mention of the giants is simply a piece of tradition which attached itself naturally to the text. Gigantic races were thought to have dwelt in Palestine before the coming of the Hebrews.² Mighty men like Nimrod had left a name to succeeding generations. Founders of cities or empires were worshipped as gods by many peoples. The Hebrew could not make them gods, for that was contrary to the

¹ For example, Josephus, *Antiquities*, I, 3, 1; Enoch, 6², 7¹, 86^{3f}; Jubilees, 5¹⁻⁶; Sulpicius Severus, *Chronica*, 2⁵. Cf. also Eisenmenger's *Entdecktes Judenthum*, I, p. 380.

² Num. 13³³. The giant Nimrod possibly once stood in connection with our passage; Budde, *Urgeschichte*, p. 391.

genius of his religion. But it was natural for him to find something superhuman in men who filled the earth with the terror of their name. The Biblical account does not condemn these heroes or tyrants; they have always been, in fact, the objects of admiration as truly as of terror. What our author is trying to do is to account for them and at the same time to account for the brevity of human life.

Enough has been said to show that we have here a piece of genuine mythology. And this characterisation extends to the whole of J's material for this period—it is mythological but not polytheistic. That he has preserved only fragments of what circulated in his time is evident.¹ What he preserved he was able to bring into harmony with the strictest monotheism. For the Yahweh of our account, anthropomorphic as He is, is yet the supreme God. No other is brought into rivalry with Him. And we may say also that He remains worthy of our reverence even in the primitive stories we have considered.

What we have found out for our Old Testament history is that this part of J contains nothing that can be called historical in the proper sense of the word. The importance which the story of the fall of man has had in the history of thought is known to everyone. But consideration of this phase of the subject belongs to the history of philosophy. It should be remarked that the influence it exercised did not begin till after the completion of the Old Testament canon. There is not one indication that the Prophets of Israel ever gave a thought to the speculations which the Yahwist has clothed for us in these attractive stories.

With this negative result in mind we turn again to the later narrative, that of P, which, as already remarked, furnished the framework into which the stories of J have been fitted. In form this document is strictly historical. It sets before us the creative work in its parts, orderly arranged in seven days. It then gives a genealogy which is also a chronology, naming the year in which each of the ten antediluvian patriarchs received a first-born son. We are thus brought to the Flood, which closes this period of the history and leaves only Noah to become the new head of the race.

It is hardly necessary to ask whether this author, living at a

¹ Other creation myths circulated in Israel down to a comparatively late date, as is shown by Gunkel, *Commentar zum Buche Genesis* (1901) p. 29 ff.

comparatively late date, had such definite and precise information concerning the early ages of the world. Such information might conceivably have come to him by special revelation,¹ but he seems to make no claim to have received it thus. As we know by his method elsewhere, he was generally dependent upon older written sources, which, however, he freely recast to meet the views of his own time. This creates a probability that here also he is similarly dependent. Moreover we should be puzzled to account for a special revelation of so early an event delivered at so late a date. If exact knowledge of the process of creation and of the longevity of the antediluvians was necessary for Israel's education in piety, it should have been given much earlier. All the probabilities, therefore, are against this account being historical, in the natural sense of that word.

In comparing the account of the creation now before us with the account in the other document, we are at once struck with the difference in tone and in the point of view. In P God is transcendent. He no longer shapes His men and animals out of clay; He does not even breathe into their nostrils; He does not plant a garden or walk therein. He speaks and it is done; He commands and it stands fast. All that is necessary is that He should say *let there be light* and the light is there; *let there be a firmament* and the firmament comes into being. He does not experiment with His material; each class of creatures comes into being according to a progressive scheme, each is conformed to a type, each is "according to its species," and each is pronounced very good at once. Mythological features are not found. The garden, the tree of life, the separate formation of woman, the serpent as the tempter—all these have disappeared. Moreover the order of creation is reversed. It is no longer man and then the animals; it is first inanimate nature, then the plants, then the lower animals, the higher animals, finally man as the crown of creation. This is an ordered, one might properly say a scientific, representation. In the account of the creation of man we might find a relic of the older anthropomorphism, for there God

¹ The theory that we have here a special revelation designed to show us the actual process of creation is still held by some scholars, or was until within a few years; cf. Köhler *Biblische Geschichte des Alten Testaments*, I, p. 22 ff. Of the enormous difficulties which such a theory meets in the opposition of geology, biology, and astronomy it is needless to speak.

says *let us make man in our own image*. No doubt the author, in accord with the great prophets of Israel, conceived God as existing in human form. But his motive here is to emphasise the supremacy of man over other created beings, a supremacy that is indicated by his creation in the divine image. Man rules over the lower animals because he is like God, and because he has received the divine commission to subdue the earth.¹ Finally an entirely new feature appears in this account, for the creative work is arranged in a creative week, as a foundation for the religious institution of the Sabbath.

These striking differences show that our author rewrote the account of the creation to suit the advanced theology of his own times. He had lost appreciation of the anthropomorphic Yahweh of the earlier time. It is probable that he had lost appreciation of his predecessor's whole philosophy. To him the hard lot of the peasant was not traceable to a primeval curse. To him it seemed necessary that a good God should make everything good. None the less he believed in a degeneracy of the race which brought punishment in the shape of a Deluge. But this was a gradual decadence extending through the antediluvian period.

It has become certain of late years that P was influenced in his account of the creation by Babylonian conceptions. The most distinct evidence of this is his use of the word *Tehôm* for the primeval abyss. This word is the Babylonian *Tiamat*, the monster inimical to the gods whose body furnishes the material of the visible universe. But, as compared with the Babylonian account, the part played by the *Tehôm* in the creation is insignificant. The Babylonian account is mythological in a high degree; it swarms with gods, demigods, monsters. The Biblical account has been divested of all mythological features. Nevertheless we may be sure that the Babylonian influence is present. In contrast with the story of J which makes the desert the type of the original chaos, we find in P that the earliest of all things is the ocean, or rather the primeval slime from which water and dry land are separated by the divine fiat. This is in accordance with the Babylonian

¹ According to the Chaldean mythology men are intelligent because made (in part) of the blood of Bel. Cf. Zimmern, *Biblische und Babylonische Urgeschichte*, p. 14. The example shows how far removed our author is from such crude speculations.

conception where Ocean and Tiamat mingle their waters at the beginning of all things.

It is hardly to be supposed that so strict a Jew as the Priestly author was, would borrow directly from Babylonian mythology, for this would be an abomination to him. But we know that Babylonian influences had reached Palestine at a very early day. Doubtless the cosmology had passed into Hebrew thought and been modified long before our author put his story into shape. Phœnician literature shows something analogous.¹

The curious reader may ask why if this author is so anxious to represent his God as thoroughly transcendent, he should leave so palpable an anthropomorphism as that contained in the sentence: *Let us make man in our image*. For it will be held that here are traces of other heavenly powers with whom God consults before carrying out His design. In reply it is only necessary to notice that in the post-exilic period, in which P belongs, the doctrine of angels was already well developed. Elohim was indeed transcendent. But He had a heavenly court made up of these high officials, with whom it was seemly for Him to take counsel in any matter of importance. It is only to mark the importance of the step now to be taken that He here departs from His usual method. Nor does He yield a jot of His pre-eminence by so doing. The angels who are invited to co-operate do not actually take part in the creation of man; they only look on as witnesses of the important work in which their sovereign is engaged.

The originality of P is perhaps sufficiently set forth in what

¹ Cf. Baudissin, *Studien zur Semit. Religionsgeschichte*, I (1876), p. 11; Dillmann, *Genesis Critically and Exegetically Expounded* (1897) p. 33 ff.; Duncker, *History of Antiquity*, I, p. 353; Holzinger, *Genesis* (Kurzer Handkommentar), p. 16 ff.; Jastrow, *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria* (1899), pp. 407-453; Zimmern, *Biblische und Babylonische Urgeschichte* (1901). Delitzsch, *Babylonische Weltschöpfungsepos* (1896), and Schrader's *Keilinsch. Bibliothek*, VI, give translations of the Babylonian texts. In English we have translations of the Babylonian account of the creation in Ball, *Light from the East* (1899), pp. 1-21; Hogarth, *Authority and Archaeology* (1899), pp. 9-15; Pinches, *The Old Testament in the Light of the Historical Records of Assyria* (1902), pp. 18-56. Cf. also *Keilinschriften und Altes Testament*,³ p. 508 ff. A mythological survival in the Hebrew account is the declaration that the sun was made *to rule* the day and the moon *to rule* the night—language that is intelligible only on the theory that the sun and moon are animated beings—gods or demigods (Zimmern).

has been said. That originality is seen not in invention of new material but in the rearrangement of what already exists. Probably we owe to him the arrangement of the creative work in the time of one week. It has often been remarked that his number of acts of creation does not really fit his scheme. The actual number of periods is eight, so that he is obliged to crowd a double work into two of the days. He seems therefore to have taken a prior account which arranged the creation in eight acts. This he compressed into six days in order to give the Sabbath for rest. That God rested on the Sabbath is also taught in one edition of the Decalogue.

The period between Adam and Noah is filled up with two genealogies, one of Cain and one of Seth.¹ The latter shows itself to belong to P by its formal and statistical character. The author is careful to begin by a repetition of the language he has already used in his account of the creation of man—that he was created in the likeness of God, that they were created male and female, and that God had blessed them. He then proceeds with the statement that Adam lived a hundred and thirty years,² and begat a son *in his likeness*. This phrase does not recur in any of the following generations, and its omission is perhaps an indication that the farther men removed from their first created ancestor the less they had of the divine image.³ Ten generations are counted, Noah being the tenth. Adam, the first, was created good; Noah, the last, was well pleasing to God; but all the race in Noah's time had corrupted its way so that a Deluge was sent to destroy all but Noah and his family. As this author ignored the story of the Fall and as he rejected the account of the angelic marriages, together with the giant progeny thereof, we must assume that in his view the corruption had come in gradually in the course of the ten generations. It is in accordance with this, that we are expressly pointed to two men in the list who were righteous: Enoch walked with God, and for his blameless life was translated. It is difficult to see why this should be said unless it was thought that Enoch was removed from a wicked

¹ Gen. 4¹⁷⁻²⁴, and 5¹⁻³².

² The variations in the different texts in the matter of numbers will be considered later.

³ This is the Rabbinical notion, *Bereshith Rabba* (Wünsche's translation, p. 108).

and perverse generation. Noah also is declared to have been righteous among his contemporaries and to have walked with God.¹ Here there can be no question that there is a contrast pointed out. This view is consistently carried out by the numbers in the Samaritan text, which make the three men who stand nearest to Enoch, namely: Jared, Methuselah, and Lamech, all perish in the Flood. But whether this proves the numbers of the Samaritan to be the original is open to question.

The numbers of this list have been made the basis of chronological systems down to a very recent time.² It is impossible longer so to use them, for in the first place it is no longer possible to believe that the lives of men ever extended to nine hundred years or more, and secondly we cannot believe that the creation of man took place at so late a date as results from this genealogy, whichever text we follow. The apologetic makeshift which interprets the names in our list as the names of "patriarchal dynasties" needs no refutation.

But while rejecting the historicity of these numbers we may yet inquire for the intention of the author. It seems altogether likely that he was proceeding upon a theory. The round number ten as the number of generations in the first period of the world's history indicates as much. In attempting to discover his general scheme, we are hampered by the differences in the texts which have come down to us. The Greek translation (in the copies most current) adds a hundred years to the period which elapsed in each man's life before the birth of his first son, except in the case of two names. When allowance is made for minor variations, this recension has still added nearly eight hundred years to the period between the Creation and the Flood. On the other hand the Samaritan text of the Pentateuch shortens

¹ Gen. 6⁹ a sentence of P, parallel to the declaration of J in 7¹.

² Christian authors have generally arranged their histories of the world on the Biblical scheme. Thus Eusebius wrote a Chronicle on this basis. The difficulty of digesting all the Biblical data into a consistent whole is shown by the number of Biblical chronologies that have been compiled. An extended list is given in the article *Zeitrechnung* in the *Protest. Realencyclopädie*. The system most widely accepted among English-speaking peoples is that of Archbishop Usher, expounded at length in his *Chronologia Sacra* (Works, Vols. XI and XII) and forming the basis of his *Annales Sacræ* (Works, Vols. VIII and IX).

the period by about three hundred and fifty years.¹ It is argued in favour of the Samaritan form of the table that it is more symmetrical, shortening men's lives gradually down to the time of Noah, who alone, as a restorer of primitive righteousness, reaches the age of Adam. Consonant with this, the same form of text makes the years of fatherhood a diminishing series down to Noah, who again forms an exception. But the Greek readings have also found numerous advocates. As pointed out by Lagarde² they are based upon a system, for they make three thousand years to have elapsed at the birth of Peleg whose name (*division*) indicates half the expected duration of the world—six thousand years. A similar calculation lies at the basis of the received Hebrew text, for, as has recently been shown, its author intended to date the building of Solomon's Temple three thousand years after the Creation. On the whole we may say that this is what we should expect from the Priestly author, as to him the Temple was really the centre of history. We need not be surprised to find such different systems imported into the text by the change of its readings, for the later Hebrew literature busied itself assiduously with dates and figures.³ Had the Priestly author carried his work beyond the Conquest, we should be more certain of his theory.

Babylonian influences seem to be indicated in this section by the ten patriarchs, for Babylonian legend makes ten kings to have reigned⁴ in the antediluvian period. There is also a curious coincidence between the 168 myriads of years which the Chaldean account assigns to the creation and the 168 hours (seven days) which the Biblical author allows for the same event.

¹ Comparative tables showing these variations are given by Heidegger, *Historia Sacra Patriarcharum*, Usher, *Chronologia Sacra*, and by several of the more recent writers, as Budde, *Biblische Urgeschichte*.

² *Symmicta*, I, p. 52 f.

³ On the three thousand years from the Creation to the Temple cf. Bousset in the *Zeitschr. für d. Alttest. Wissenschaft*, 1900, p. 136 ff. The three thousand years are pointed out in IV Esdras, while the Assumption of Moses apparently indicates the same figure. The Book of Jubilees counts fifty jubilee periods of forty-nine years each to the conquest of Canaan.

⁴ According to Berossus. No correspondence in the names can be discovered. Professor Hommel's ingenious attempt in the *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, 1893, p. 243 ff., was probably not intended to be taken seriously. Traces of Babylonian influence are, however, recognised by Gunkel, *Genesis*, p. 121 f.

We can scarcely avoid seeing here an intentional contradiction—the power of God was such that He did in an hour what the heathen mythologist supposed would take ten thousand years. Other calculations intended to bring the Hebrew numbers into relation with those of the Chaldean account are too complicated to command much confidence.¹ What is more to our purpose here is the evident dependence of this genealogy upon the genealogy of Cain which just precedes it in our text. Adam, Enoch, and Lamech are names common to the two lists. In the Greek two others are alike, a fact which points to their original identity; for in this case dissimilation is a more probable result of transmission than assimilation. In any case the resemblance of Mehujael to Mahaleel, of Methushael to Methuselah, of Cainan to Cain is sufficiently striking to attract our attention. Irad and Jared differ by only a letter, and Enosh is a synonym of Adam. These resemblances and identities make it quite certain that the Priestly writer has copied and adapted the names given by his predecessor. Conjectures which find in these names² mythological survivals should therefore be applied to the Cainite table only.

Now the Cainite table is apparently a Palestinian production. Cain the son of Adam must be the progenitor of the well-known Kenites, the friends and allies of Israel.³ Wanderers and nomads they were during the whole history of Israel. It does not seem violent to see in the other names of the list clan names. In fact we find *Enoch* as the name of a clan of Bedawin.⁴ *Irad* can scarcely be distinguished from *Arad*, a district of the Wilderness; but such districts are often named from the clans that inhabit them. Tubal has been recognised as the eponym of the Tibareni, while Jabal and Jubal are expressly called fathers of tent-dwell-

¹ Still it is remarkable that the number of weeks in the 1656 years of Genesis is the number of five-year periods in the Chaldean sum (432,000 years); see Marti's article *Chronology* in the *Encyclop. Biblica*. Furthermore, Enoch, the seventh in the Biblical list, corresponds to the seventh Babylonian king who was called by the sun-god into his presence, and instructed in the secrets of astronomy and astrology. Zimmern, *Biblische und Babyl. Urgesch.*, p. 29, and also in *Keilinschriften und Altes Testament*,³ p. 540 ff.

² Cf., for example, Ewald, *Geschichte*,³ I, p. 383 (Eng. Trans. I, p. 267 f.).

³ The name of the man and the name of the clan are exactly the same in Hebrew, notice Num. 24²², Jd. 4¹¹.

⁴ Gen. 25⁴—a son of Midian would of course be a clan of Bedawin.

ing and music-loving tribes. Vanished tribes, like Ad and Thamud in Arabic literature, might well be called Mehujael (*wiped out by God*) and Methushael (*man of Sheol*).

It only confirms this to notice that Lamech is the typical Bedawy. In possession of the sword invented by his son, the smith, he trusts in his good right arm to avenge him on his enemies:

“Hearken to my voice, wives of Lamech!
Give ear to my speech.
I shall surely slay a man for wounding me,
And a lad for striking me!
If Cain is avenged sevenfold,
Then Lamech seventy and seven.”¹

The ability and the readiness to answer blow with blow and to take abundant revenge for insults are admired in this state of society. We have no reason to suppose that the Lamech here depicted was anything but an admirable character to the earliest reciter of his story. The theory sometimes advanced that Lamech is introduced as the inventor of polygamy, and that he is condemned for his innovation, is entirely without foundation.

In these early chapters of Genesis we thus discover various strata of tradition. Perhaps the oldest is the nomad saga of Cain. According to this, the nomad Cain was the first-born of Adam. His descendants followed their father's profession down to Lamech, who was in fierceness and strenuousness all that the Bedawy ought to be. From his sons sprang the various divisions of mankind—hereditary guilds of herdsmen, smiths, and musicians. With this nomad saga we may class the earliest creation story, for, as we have seen, this story made the creation begin with the uninhabitable desert. In this desert Yahweh began by planting a garden. If the desert was Northern Arabia, the Garden was probably the oasis of Damascus.² In the Garden,

¹ Gen. 4^{23f}. The Song of Lamech has given rise to much discussion. I have adopted the interpretation of Stade. See his article on *Das Kains-zeichen* in his *Zeitschrift*, 1894, 1895, reprinted in his *Ausgewählte Akademische Reden und Abhandlungen*, 1899.

² The description of the Garden and its four rivers in Gen. 2¹⁰⁻¹⁵ is a later insertion. It evidently expresses Babylonian ideas and intends to locate Eden in Babylonia. That the original Hebrew tradition would put the creation of man in Syria was seen by earlier authors (as Heidegger, *Historia Sacra Patriarcharum*, pp. 126, 142). The only Biblical occurrence

man was too ambitious. He aspired after the knowledge that should make him like God, and he was therefore expelled. A sign was granted him, however, as a pledge that God had not altogether deserted him amid the dangers of the desert. When the race began to multiply on earth came the intermarriage with the jinn, resulting in a state of anarchy. This culminated in the building of the tower of Babel—rumors of whose vastness must have reached the desert-dwellers far and wide. Yahweh intervened for His own protection, and the resulting state of division among men has continued until the present day. In this narrative, Noah appears to be the discoverer of the vine and the progenitor of the inhabitants of Canaan.

The Israelite peasant had a less favourable view of the Bedawy and his life—marauding and murderous as he knew it to be. To him such a life seemed to be the punishment for some great crime. Hence the author who gave the tradition literary form injected into the narrative the story of Cain and Abel—what more likely than the murder of the unoffending Abel by the Kenite patriarch? In the light of this story the mark of Cain receives a new significance, though even here it is not the *stigma* which popular interpretation makes it. The author who made this insertion had received also the tradition of the Deluge, and he fitted it into his narrative as best he might, making the marriage of the angels prepare the way for it.

Some time later P took up the subject. The treatment was too elaborate and too mythological for him. He therefore boldly rewrote the whole section. After the Creation he needed only the genealogical table, whose names he borrowed, inserting the chronological data. His theory of the freedom of the will probably accounts for his making the corruption of mankind a gradual process. In the course of ten generations corruption became rife and the Deluge followed. Cain and Abel disappeared and Seth alone remained as the son of Adam from whom all mankind are derived.

We have thus representatives of various schools of thought

of the name Eden before the Exile is Am. 1⁵ which brings it into connection with Damascus. Further discussion of the location of Eden would be out of place in an Old Testament History. The reader may consult Friedrich Delitzsch, *Wo Lag das Paradies?* (1881). That the name Eden was also Babylonian is probably true, see Paton, *Early History of Syria and Palestine*, p. 52.

putting before us their theories of the beginnings of mankind.¹ The redactor had too much reverence for literature to take sides with either against the other. He thought it a pity to lose either document. He therefore combined them into a single narrative. Doubtless there floated more or less distinctly before his mind a theory which has been widely accepted since his time—the theory, namely, that two types of humanity which may be labelled the good and the bad, or the pious and the depraved, existed from the beginning. The tribe of Cain represents the sinners, the ungodly, the heathen; while in the tribe of Seth we find the pious, the righteous, the people of God.

Instead of information concerning the beginning of things we have in these documents therefore a revelation of the progress of religious thought in Israel from the mythologically coloured anthropomorphism of the ninth century before Christ down to the transcendental (if somewhat cold) spiritual philosophy of the post-exilic period. It has already been remarked that mythological as the earliest sources appear they are not polytheistic. In each of the documents Yahweh alone is the God of Israel, and He is also the Creator of the world and of mankind.²

The end of the first age of the world is marked by the Flood of Noah. Our account of it is made up from two documents which we naturally suppose to be the continuation of the two hitherto considered. There is indeed considerable ground for the asser-

¹ The reader who is interested in the various points of view now combined in our book of Genesis should study carefully the excellent discussion of Carpenter and Battersby in the first volume of their work *The Hexateuch* (1900, also published as a separate volume), especially pp. 57 ff., 121, 135 f.; and Gunkel's *Legends of Genesis* (1902).

² Until recent times all attempts to present Old Testament History have gone on the assumption that these early chapters of Genesis were a record of what actually took place at the beginning of the world. This treatment began with Josephus the Jewish historian, who paraphrased the Biblical account at the opening of his *Antiquities*. Among Christian writers who have followed this method may be mentioned Sulpicius Severus, whose two books of *Chronicles* were widely read (*Sulpicii Severi Chronicorum Libri Duo*, Vindobonæ, 1866). After the Reformation, Biblical history was treated by many prominent theologians. One of the best examples is Buddeus, *Historia Ecclesiastica Veteris Testamenti*, 1715, often reprinted. The latest endeavour to construct a history on this theory is that of Köhler, *Lehrbuch der Biblischen Geschichte Alten Testaments*, 1875-1893. In the first chapter of this work there is an extended bibliography of the subject. Recent authors usually begin their history at a later period.

tion that the earliest Yahwist had no knowledge of a Deluge.¹ But in the expanded form of his narrative which was wrought into our Genesis the Deluge was already contained. We have no difficulty in dissecting out his story. In immediate connection with the account of the marriage of the Sons of God and the daughters of men we have a strong statement of the corruption of the earth: "Yahweh saw that the evil of man was great and every purpose of his mind was only evil all the time."² This state of things is so distasteful to Yahweh that He repents of having made man and resolves to wipe out the race. Noah alone finds favour with Him and is made an exception. He receives the command to build an ark,³ and when it is completed has seven days' warning, within which period he brings in the animals as he is commanded. There are to be seven of each species of clean, and two of each species of unclean animals. This is to provide for sacrificial worship after the Flood, and the form of the command shows this writer's theory (known also from the account of Cain and Abel) that sacrifice is as old as the race.

At the end of the seven days Noah and his family enter the ark and the rain begins. The rain continues forty days and the waters swell steadily for this period. Yahweh thus blots out all that He has made from the face of the ground. As the waters are forty days in swelling they are also forty days in ebbing.⁴ Noah then sends out the raven, but is apparently convinced that this bird is not the right one to give him the information he desires. He therefore sends out the dove (seven days later) who returns to him at evening. After another interval of seven days he makes another attempt with the dove and is rewarded with a

¹ It is difficult to see what interest an author would have had in a genealogy of Cain, and in the developing civilisation of his descendants if that whole race was to be exterminated by the Deluge.

² This declaration (Gen. 6⁵) follows now upon the statement that the Nephilim were on the earth in those days, and that these were the mighty men that were of old time. As the account now reads, therefore, the corruption of man is the sequel of the marriage of the angels with human wives. Whether this was the idea of the earliest writer is doubtful.

³ The command to build the ark as originally contained in J is now lost, having been displaced by the account of P. We must remember the redactor's method—to make P the framework into which so much of J was fitted as was possible.

⁴ Such I take to be the meaning of 8⁶; the original datum has been displaced.

freshly plucked olive leaf. After another week he is convinced that it is time to leave the ark. His first act is a sacrifice, on reception of which Yahweh vows never to repeat the destruction.

The resemblance between the Biblical account and a Babylonian story has been known ever since the days of Berossus, a Babylonian priest who wrote a history of his own people in the fourth century B.C. His account of the Flood shows the following points of resemblance to the one we have been considering: (a) the hero Xisuthrus is the tenth in the line of kings which begins with the Creation, as Noah is the tenth from Adam; (b) the deity commands him to build a ship, and to take into it his friends and relations with everything necessary to sustain life, as well as animals, both birds and quadrupeds; (c) the command is carried out and the flood visits the earth; (d) afterward Xisuthrus sends out some birds to see whether the waters have disappeared, an experiment which he repeats the second time, when they come back with mud on their feet, and a third time, when they return no more; (e) on quitting the vessel, Xisuthrus offers sacrifice to the gods; (f) the mountain on which the ark stranded is in Armenia.

The original Babylonian texts now in our possession confirm the account of Berossus, though, as we should expect, they are more highly mythological than his reproduction. From them we learn that the destruction of mankind was determined by a council of all the gods. But Ea ventured to disregard the will of the majority and resolved to save his favourite. This hero¹ receives in a dream the command to build the ship. He builds it and makes it tight with asphalt. The rain which comes on after he enters the ark is described most vividly — Ramman² the thunderer makes his voice heard; black clouds overspread the heavens; the furies (*Annunaki*) bear about the torches of the lightning. The gods themselves cower before the storm and seek refuge in the upper heaven. Ishtar shrieks at the loss of her worshippers. Seven days of such violence are enough to accomplish the object. After the ark strands upon the mountain called

¹ His name is given in different forms by the Assyriologists, *Ut-napishtim* is given by Jensen. Ball (*Light from the East*, 1899) makes it *Nuh-napishtim*. Pinches (*Old Test. in the Light of the Historical Records of Assyria and Babylon*, 1902) returns to the earlier form *Pir-napishtim*.

² According to Winckler; the god is called *Adad* by Jensen.

Nisir, the hero waits seven days and then sends out in succession a dove, a swallow, and a raven—at what intervals we are not told. When he comes out he offers a sacrifice, over which the gods gather like flies to enjoy the sweet odour. Bel alone is angry that a human being has escaped, but at the intercession of Ea he is appeased and raises the builder of the ark, his wife, and the steersman to the rank of gods.¹

The resemblances between the Hebrew and the Babylonian account are so marked that we conclude one must be borrowed from the other. It is plain that the Babylonian is the original. The attempt to trace both to a common source in primitive Semitic tradition is unsuccessful. The Hebrew text cannot be older than the ninth century B.C. The Babylonian, from which it was borrowed, is part of a great epic poem which must have had a complicated literary history. The epic did not treat the same problem which the Hebrew writer had in mind. The repopulation of the world after the Deluge is quite lost sight of in the account of Xisuthrus. His life is recounted to show that one and another of the children of man has escaped death and been transported to the dwelling of the gods. But this is only to show Gilgamesh, the real hero of the poem, that death is in fact the universal lot—the exceptions only prove the rule. It would be wrong to say then that the Babylonian tradition concerns a total destruction of mankind and a new head of the race. So far as appears, it did not regard the destruction of mankind as complete, and it certainly did not make the new race begin with the hero who escaped the Flood.

What the account shows is that a Hebrew author took the story, closely following its details, from Babylonian sources and adapted it to his purpose. It is unnecessary for us to inquire for the historical content of the Hebrew story. The occasion

¹ The fragments of Berossus are given in Cory's *Ancient Fragments* (1833) and in Winckler's *Keilinschriftliches Textbuch* (1892). A translation may be found in Lenormant's *Beginnings of History* (N. Y., 1882). The Cuneiform text, which is part of the Gilgamesh epic, is published in transliteration, with translation by Haupt, in Schrader's *Keilinschriften und Altes Testament*² (1883, also in English translation, *The Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament*, 1885–88), by Winckler in his *Textbuch* and by Jensen in the *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek*, VI (1900). Compare also Jastrow's *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria* (1898) pp. 495–506 and the book of Pinches cited in the preceding note.

of the Babylonian original may have been some frightful rain-storm followed by wide spread inundation of the Euphrates valley. We may well excuse ourselves also from the task of defending the accuracy of the account, and from the attempt to prove that a vessel of the size of Noah's could contain all that it was built to contain.¹ Nor need we spend time on the question of the universality of the Deluge. No doubt the author supposed it to cover the entire surface of the earth. Nor can we argue either the universality or the actuality of the catastrophe from the number of Deluge stories that have been discovered in various quarters of the globe.² If the tradition arose in Babylonia from an inundation of the Euphrates, similar stories are likely to arise in the valley of any great river. We are not surprised, therefore, to find a Deluge story in China, where the Hoangho has so frightfully devastated the land many times since history began to be written, or in the valley of the Ganges. It is noticeable, however, that Egypt knows no Deluge, because the overflow of the Nile is a beneficent instead of a destructive episode. If there were a universal primitive tradition, we should expect to find it in Egypt, so that the argument from silence has great weight.³

Two forms of the story deserve brief notice. One is the Syrian, alluded to in connection with the sanctuary at Hierapolis, where the cleft in the earth was pointed out through which the great flood had passed into the earth.⁴ From the locality in which this tradition is found we have no difficulty in supposing Babylonian influence. The more famous story is that of Deukalion, which also, in the form in which it has come down to us, may have felt Babylonian influence. In its main stock, however, the

¹ An elaborate argument of this kind is contained in Lilienthal, *Gute Sache der Göttlichen Offenbarung*, V (1754). Of course the extension of our zoological knowledge makes such an attempt increasingly difficult.

² Perhaps the most elaborate argument of this kind is Harcourt's *Doctrine of the Deluge* (2 vols., 1838), which, however, suffers from a vicious method. The author strives to force the most irrelevant traditions, names, and customs into support of his thesis.

³ The Flood legends are collected in a little book by Andree, *Die Flutsagen* (1891), and are compendiously treated by Diestel, *Die Sintflut und die Flutsagen des Altertums* (1876).

⁴ The treatise on the *Syrian Goddess* ascribed to Lucian gives this story, and names Deukalion as the hero of the Flood. But the name Deukalion is probably introduced for the sake of Greek readers. The reference is *De Syria Dea*, 12, 13.

story of Deukalion is a purely Greek myth, having nothing to do with a Deluge. Greek mythology knows of a number of gods and heroes carried in chests or arks across the sea. The germ of these representations is the rising of the sun out of the sea and his triumphant progress across its waves shown in the glancing of his light from crest to crest. That the Greek Deukalion is one of these, seems evident from the name.¹ In this view it is significant that Xisuthrus in Babylonia, and Manu in the Indian story are also gods. The common origin, if there be one, is in a myth of the sun god. But further discussion of this phase of the subject does not belong here.²

Heretofore we have considered only the earlier form of the Hebrew Flood story—the one recorded by J. The Priestly writer, however, also treated the subject. In fact it fitted in excellently with his conception of God as the almighty Judge of mankind. His account is apparently preserved for us entire, and it differs from that of his predecessor by its detailed and schematic character. He makes it a distinct chapter of his work, under the title of the Genealogy of Noah. He enumerates the sons of Noah and gives their names. The dimensions of the ark, its division into storys, and its materials are also given. The door and the window³ are mentioned.

The thoroughness of the destruction is stated in unmistakable language. But where the earlier account commands that seven animals of the kind fit for sacrifice be brought into the ark with two of other species, this author makes no distinction, bringing in a single pair of each kind. The kinds are enumerated in language that reminds us of this author's account of the creation: "Of birds after their kind and of cattle after their kind, and of all the creepers of the ground after their kind."⁴ Behind this alteration

¹ Deukalion is a diminutive of Zeus. The whole subject is discussed in the most interesting manner by Usener, *Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen* III (1899), cf. also *Encyc. Biblica*, I, Col. 1059.

² Besides the literature already cited the student may consult the commentaries on Genesis, and especially Buttmann's *Mythologus*, I, p. 180 ff. Buttmann may be said to have begun the scientific study of the subject.

³ The word for window indeed occurs nowhere else in the Old Testament, but the author who reflected on all the details must have supposed light necessary to the inmates of the great chest.

⁴ Gen. 6²⁰, cf. also 7¹⁴. It is, of course, very possible that P based his account on some Flood story that has not been preserved to us. Cf. Gunkel, *Genesis*, p. 92.

of his predecessor's data is the theory that sacrifice was not offered until the giving of the Law. A marked feature of this account is the Chronology. The beginning of the Deluge is dated in the six hundredth year of Noah's life, in the second month, the seventeenth day of the month. As the year probably began in the autumn, the season of the opening Flood would be that of the winter rains.¹ The culmination of the waters is dated on the seventeenth day of the seventh month. The first stage of their recession is marked at the first day of the tenth month. The complete disappearance of the waters is recorded on the first day of the new year, and Noah's exit from the ark takes place on the twenty-seventh of the second month. The whole duration of the Flood is therefore one year and ten days.

It is generally conceded that the author intends to indicate an exact solar year by his calculation; for a solar year is about ten days more than twelve lunations. That the early Hebrews calculated the month by observation of the moon is well known. It was forcibly brought to their attention, therefore, that the solar year, necessarily at the basis of the agricultural calendar, did not fit in with the lunar computation. The intercalation of an additional month was the method taken² to bring them into harmony. All that we are now interested to observe is that our author makes the solar year twelve months and ten days. In fact the excess of the solar year above twelve lunations is about eleven days. But as we have elsewhere an obstinate defence of a year of 364 days we may assume that Jewish tradition had fixed upon this number in defiance of exact astronomical observation.³ More difficulty is made by his reckoning five months at a hundred and fifty days, as he is seen to do when we compare Gen. 7²⁴ with 8³. Either he was here influenced by the

¹ According to P the reckoning of the spring month Abib as the beginning of the year dates from Moses. The Babylonian account makes the Flood begin in winter. Cf. *Encyc. Bib.*, I, Col. 1059.

² So we judge from the Talmud. There is no Old Testament affirmation on the subject.

³ The Book of Jubilees explicitly declares that a year is 364 days, that is, exactly fifty-two weeks. This seems to be an *a priori* affirmation—God would make His year an exact number of weeks, the week being the foundation of His calendar. The book of Enoch is also tenacious of a year of 364 days. Both these books rest upon the account in Genesis, as is shown by Bacon, *Hebraica* VIII, p. 126.

alleged Babylonian custom of counting thirty days to a month, or else more than one hand has been concerned in the narrative.

As we should expect from this author's larger conception of the power of God, his account is more distinctly miraculous than that of his predecessor. The rain, however violent, is not enough (as he supposes) to bring about the flood. The windows of the great celestial storehouse of water are therefore opened and the fountains of the subterranean reservoir burst out. In accordance with the greatness of the calamity is the completeness of the destruction: "And there died all flesh that moves on the earth, birds and cattle and wild animals and the swarming life on the earth, as well as all mankind." The height of the waters is not left to the imagination—fifteen cubits above the highest mountain satisfies all the requirements. Another miraculous feature seems to be that P makes the animals come to Noah at the time they are needed, without any effort on his part to collect them.

So far, the narrator has simply rewritten the story according to his presuppositions. One detail remains in which he has enriched the text; after the Deluge God makes a covenant with Noah—or rather grants a covenant to Noah, for in P the Deity never appears as one of the contracting parties to an agreement; He imposes regulations or grants privileges as the Sovereign of the universe. The constitution here imposed extends the rights of man over the animals so that he may use them as food. With the permission comes, however, a strict prohibition of the eating of blood. This is in accordance with P's theory that the Law was the culmination of God's revelations to mankind, and that it was preceded by rudimentary regulations designed to lead up to it. On this theory antediluvian man received the fruits as his portion, with no legislation except the command to subdue the earth to cultivation. Noah received permission to eat flesh, accompanied by a prohibition of blood and of murder. Abraham received the ordinance of circumcision with a strict command to observe it. Moses received the full legal system. It does not seem out of place, therefore, that this arrangement is recorded here. The eating of blood was so abhorrent to the Jew that he could not suppose it was ever allowed even to the Gentile world. Possibly our author was aware that in some Gentile religions the eating of blood was regarded as sacrilegious. It would be easy

for him to conclude that mankind had received the prohibition before the dispersion of the descendants of Noah.

At first sight it seems highly mythological, and therefore contrary to the view of P, that the rainbow is introduced as the sign of the covenant. It is, of course, possible that this item was originally in J, and copied from him by P. The bow was originally the bow of the Thunderer, which he laid aside at the conclusion of the storm. This is its real mythological interpretation, and in this view of it we see how far our author is from the original mythology. To him the bow has become simply the sign of the covenant—just as circumcision is in the divine good pleasure made a sign of the covenant with Abraham. From this point of view the bow has a reason for existence in the account in which we find it. Babylonian or Assyrian parallels have not yet been discovered. Nor can we say in general that the details of P show Babylonian influence.¹

Our examination of the story of the Deluge confirms what we discovered in regard to the account of the Creation. Historical, it cannot be called. In its origin it is mythological, with a possible early inundation of the Euphrates as its basis in actual occurrence. From Babylon it wandered to the west and was naturalised in Canaan. An early Israelite writer stripped it of its polytheism and made it tell of the justice of Yahweh upon a race of aggressors. After the Exile the Priestly author, finding it too primitive in its theology, pruned it of its more anthropomorphic features and made it introduce God's earliest covenant. A redactor, to whom we cannot be too grateful, thought it a pity to lose either story, and combined the two in a single narrative. History of the world is not given by it; history of Israel's tradition is here in abundance.

¹ Of course we do not know what Assyriology may yet have in store for us. Jensen (*Encyc. Bib.*, I, col. 1060) supposes the rainbow to belong to J originally. It should be remarked that the prohibition of blood is supposed by some to be a later insertion; cf. Holzinger in Marti, *Handkommentar*.

CHAPTER III

THE PATRIARCHS

THE greater part of the Book of Genesis is taken up with the history of the Patriarchs. After the confusion of tongues the next great event is the call of Abraham. In obedience to this call he leaves the East and comes to Canaan. What follows is the family history of the progenitors of Israel, ending with the settlement of the whole clan in Egypt. Abraham himself lives the nomad life in Canaan. He pitches his tent at different points from Shechem to the border of Egypt, on occasion going into Egypt itself. Isaac leads a more settled life, being found for the most part in the Negeb or South Country. Jacob is a man of many wanderings, spending his youth in Canaan, but going to the East for his wives, returning to Canaan with great possessions, and emigrating to Egypt in his old age.

The many duplicates in the story and the inconsistencies of its parts cause us to pursue the analysis which we have already begun. It is not difficult to discover the main strands of the narrative, which have now become three in number. The framework continues to be furnished by the Priestly writer, whose fondness for numbers and for orderly arrangement we have had occasion to notice. If we had his book alone, our material would be very limited. In the life of Abraham he begins with a genealogy which gives the Patriarch his place in the line of Seth. The emigration from Ur-Kasdim to Haran and from Haran to Canaan is narrated very briefly. The separation from Lot requires but a single sentence. The only incidents of importance to the writer are: the covenant between God and the Patriarch, which is ratified by the seal of circumcision; the promise of a son, which is followed by the birth of Isaac; and the death of Sarah, which gives occasion for the purchase of the cave of Machpelah. This can hardly be called a life of Abraham; it is the barest outline designed to embody a theory of universal history.

Isaac and Jacob inherit the promises—this is about all we can say of them as they appear in the sketch of P. The older stories were not wanting in details that gave offence to the later writer. Hence his bare mention of Isaac, and the summary way in which Jacob is treated. This father of the tribes is sent to the East to get a wife of kindred blood. The return is followed by a revelation at Bethel, with the change of name from Jacob to Israel. The story of Joseph shrinks to a mere allusion, but we receive a list of Jacob's descendants, and are told of his death and burial.

This outline shows that we cannot depend upon P for historical material. His interest is not at all in the life of the Patriarchs, and indeed his Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are without individuality and without life. Very different is the impression made when we turn to the other documents, or the composite narrative into which they have been woven. Here, at any rate, is life, and here is colour. We are admitted to the family of the heroes, hear their prevarications and quarrels, see the sanctuaries at which they worship, admire the hospitality of Abraham and his faith, follow with breathless attention the romantic fortunes of Joseph, and rejoice with him when he welcomes his aged father to a new home. The charm and power of these stories are attested by the hold they have had upon a hundred generations of readers.

In the troublesome task of getting at real history, however, we are confronted at once by difficulties. The El-Amarna tablets show us the condition of Canaan at the time when our documents suppose the Patriarchs to be sojourning there. We learn that the country was thickly settled, the inhabitants living in fortified towns which were often at war with each other. Nomad tribes were pressing in from the desert, making the open country unsafe, and even compelling the towns to make terms with them. This state of things seems to have been chronic. It leaves no place for the peaceable immigrant like Abraham. For the most striking thing about our stories is the absence of real warfare. The authors are indeed aware that the Canaanite was then in the land, but the knowledge has left scarcely a trace on the narrative. When Abraham and Lot, with their flocks and herds, separate, it is only because the land is not able to bear them; that is, because there is not pasture enough for the cattle. Never a word is there of Canaanitish opposition to such overrunning of the country. The eternal feud between the cultivator and the shep-

herd is known to us in later times. We are sure that a nomad clan could not occupy the pasture lands except at the point of the sword. But Abraham's sword nowhere appears in the narrative. There might be an arrangement such as at a later time existed between the Kenites and the Hebrews. But this is a covenant relation, and Abraham never enters into covenant with the Canaanites. There is a covenant relation established between Abraham (or Isaac) and Abimelech at Gerar.¹ But even this covenant only establishes the title to some wells. It could not give the nomads general rights of pasture throughout the country.

The picture presented by the authors of Genesis seems to assume that the Patriarchs moved about the country, finding no let or hindrance from anyone. They built altars, and so established sanctuaries where they would. We might almost think of the land as entirely without inhabitants were it not for the express declaration of the presence of the Canaanite already cited. Two incidents only, seem to throw more light on the situation. The first of these is Abraham's battle with the kings, narrated in Genesis 14. Here, to our surprise, Abraham appears as a general. He has a body of trained slaves which enables him to defeat an army of regulars. The inconsistency of the picture with what we find elsewhere is plain enough. Where was this valiant band of retainers when Sarah was taken into the harem of Pharaoh? The doubt suggested by the discordance in the accounts is confirmed by closer examination of the narrative of victory itself. The route of Chedorlaomer² is unintelligible if his objective point was the cities of the Plain. The mustering of four Mesopotamian kings against the five towns was ludicrously out of proportion. The victory of Abraham, the complete recovery of the spoil, and the lack of any attempt on the part of Chedorlaomer to re-establish himself, are alike inconceivable. We are compelled, therefore, to leave this section out of our calculation. Its discordance with the general picture is too pronounced to allow us to regard it as historical.³

¹ Gen. 21 and 26. The two accounts are duplicates of one tradition.

² The archaic allusion to Rephaim and Zuzim (Gen. 14⁵⁻⁷), and other long-perished nations seems to be based on the notice in Deut. 2. The route around the Dead Sea, into the desert and back, is impracticable for an army.

³ Desperate attempts have been made of late years to rescue the historicity of this chapter, on the ground of Babylonian literature. All that seems to be

Before examining the other case of Patriarchal warfare we must consider the general question which confronts us: In what sense are the names of the Patriarchs understood by the original authors? In response to this we must admit that Jacob or Israel is in the Old Testament, for the most part, the name of a people rather than of an individual. In the earlier prophets the Patriarchs as individuals do not appear. When we consider that the stories of J and E are earlier than Amos, this is a remarkable fact. It seems to indicate that Amos and Hosea, at any rate, had little idea of the Patriarchs as individual men.¹ To the Oriental it is natural to speak of the clan as an individual. Thus the Arab will use indifferently the sentences, *The Banu Nizar made a foray*, and *Nizar made a foray*. Hebrew usage was not different, as we see from such a sentence as, "Israel went out to meet Philistim in war."² The same fact is abundantly illustrated in the genealogical tables. The author of Genesis 10 groups the nations of his world in families. The "sons" of Japhet are Gomer, Magog, Madai, Javan, Tubal, Meshech, and Tiras. From other references in the Old Testament we have no difficulty in identifying these names as the names of nations. Equally transparent is the assertion that the "sons" of Ham are Cush, Egypt, Phut, and Canaan. Almost more expressive is the declaration that Egypt begat Ludim, Anamim, Lehabim, Naphtuchim, Pathrusim, Casluhim, and Caphtorim.³ The names in this sentence are in form names of tribes, and never were anything else. What the author has in mind is that the people of Egypt fall into groups which

established is that the author of our section knew by tradition of early Elamitic supremacy in Western Asia. The reader may compare Hommel, *Altisraelitische Ueberlieferung* (1897), pp. 147-202, and the article *Chedorlaomer* in the *Encyc. Bib.*, I, 732, also Gunkel, *Handkommentar*, Genesis, p. 262 ff.

¹ Amos uses the names Isaac, Jacob, and Israel always of the people, never of individuals. Hosea in one passage (12³⁻¹²) alludes to the history of Jacob as an individual. Abraham does not appear in the prophetic literature till the Exile. Cf. Hollmann, *Untersuchungen über die Erzwäter bei den Propheten* (1897).

² 1 Sam. 4¹, where the English disguises the fact that *Philistim* is a personification like Israel.

³ Gen. 10¹². The Hebrew adds *out of which* (Casluhim, but perhaps more properly to be attached to Caphtorim) *came forth Philistim*. This is doubtless a later insertion, but the point of view of authors and editors is the same in the matter we are now considering.

call themselves Ludim, Anamim, and so on. It is doubtful whether he supposed there ever was a man called Egypt or that he had sons whom he named Ludim or Anamim. The genealogical scheme was a convenient way of representing the facts of geography and it was nothing more. Even if the Biblical writers supposed that nations or tribes descended from a single individual, we are able to say on the basis of large historical investigation that this is never the case. The nation of Egypt had existed for thousands of years before the earliest Hebrew writer reflected on history. It is quite certain that the nation could not trace its origin to a single ancestor.

It is doubtful whether we are on more secure footing in the other genealogical sections. We may take for example the family of Esau.¹ One of his wives was Oholibama, which is quite certainly a clan. Among his sons or grandsons we find Teman, Kenaz, and Amalek, which also are names of place or clan. When we reflect on the number of Edomite clans which must have perished without leaving any record of themselves, we see the strong probability that if our knowledge were more complete we should be able to identify all the names in the list as names of clans. Esau would then take his place by the side of Egypt, as simply the eponym of the Edomite people. We come to the same result when we examine the table of Ishmael. In this case we know that Ishmael itself is a tribe name, as is Hagar. Among the descendants we recognise Nebaioth, Kedar, Dumah, Massa, and Tema as place or clan names. And when we turn to the list of Abraham's descendants by Keturah we identify Midian, Sheba, Dedan, and Ephah without difficulty.²

These examples enable us to assert that the common method of our Hebrew writers (for all the documents are alike in this respect) was to personify clans, tribes, nations, or geographical divisions, and treat them as individuals. Probably the writers themselves were in many cases aware that the individuals of whom they wrote were only personifications—it is impossible that a single man should bear the name Capthorim or Philistim. The author who affirmed that Canaan begat Sidon and Heth and the whole

¹ Gen. 36. The list of "dukes" of Edom is simply a list of clans inhabiting the country.

² Gen. 25^{1-6, 12-17}. The identifications may be considerably increased in number with the help of the inscriptions.

list of nations of that group, must have known that he was using imagery—as well as a writer of the present day knows what he means when he speaks of Columbia and her daughters.

The names of the sons of Jacob are all names of tribes, and what is true of the names just considered must be true of these also. This is made clear by the oldest portions of our literature. By common consent we may consider under this head the Song of Deborah and the Testament of Jacob.¹ In the former we find Reuben sarcastically questioned: "Why didst thou sit among the ash-heaps, to listen to the pipings at the sheepfolds?" The Reuben thus addressed is the tribe. In the rest of the poem Gilead, Dan, Asher, Zebulon, and Naphtali are likewise mentioned or apostrophised as individuals. This is of course only legitimate poetical personification, and it might not throw any light on usage elsewhere. But the comparison of this poem with the Testament of Jacob is instructive, for in the latter the casual reader may find individuals where tribes alone were in the mind of the writer. "Simeon and Levi are brothers; deceit and violence are their weapons"²—the verse would apply to individual warriors, and in view of the story of Dinah we should naturally interpret it so. But when we read further, "I will divide them in Jacob and scatter them in Israel," we see distinctly that the tribes must be in the writer's mind. With this clue we may go through the poem, and we discover that all the personages are personifications.³ Judah is the tribe that rejoices in conquest and in the cultivation of the vine—the Patriarch Judah had no such character. Zebulon lives on the sea-shore; Issachar is a tributary, rendering forced labour to his master; Dan is a highway robber; Gad is a rider on forays; Asher is a cultivator; Joseph is a successful warrior and is blessed with a fertile country; Benjamin is a warrior and plunderer. The author could scarcely have put together a list that differed more widely from the character of the individual Patriarchs. But applied to the tribes, everything is appropriate.

¹ Judges 5 and Gen. 49.

² The verse (Gen. 49⁵) is obscure in some of its words, but the general sense is sufficiently clear.

³ Reuben alone seems to be an exception, but even in his case there is only one sentence (v.⁴) that requires an individualistic interpretation. This sentence must therefore be a poetical representation of some tribal episode now lost to us.

What we have seen in these oldest documents is the constant personification of the tribes, with the consciousness that tribes are meant. In other passages of Genesis the same consciousness crops out. Thus Rebekah is told: "Two nations are in thy womb"—not two men, or two fathers of tribes. In Isaac's blessing upon his son Jacob we read:

"May nations serve thee, and peoples bow before thee;
Be lord over thy brothers, and may thy mother's sons bow before thee."

It would be pertinent to ask why *brothers* and *mother's sons* are mentioned in the plural when Jacob never had but one brother. Besides, it was never true of Jacob the Patriarch that nations served him. There can be no doubt that the poet's whole field of vision was occupied by the two peoples Edom and Israel. This is strikingly confirmed by the other benediction (if we call it so) in the same story:

"Away from the rich fields shall be thy dwelling;
And without the dew of heaven from above;
By thy sword thou shalt live; and thy brother thou shalt serve;
But when thou growest strong, thou shalt break his yoke from thy neck."¹

Here also the people of Edom are really the subject—Esau never served his brother, but the Edomites were subjugated by David, and later threw off the yoke thus placed upon them. In this instance we have a clear case in which the story of the Patriarchs is a poetic reflection of the historical relations of two peoples.

Historical relations rather than historical incidents are reflected in these stories. In a few instances historical incidents may be behind the story. The most striking example is the story of Dinah, already alluded to as one of the two warlike incidents in the lives of the Patriarchs. We must suppose that what actually took place was something as follows: In the course of the immigration of Israel the people came into conflict with the town of Shechem. One clan (Dinah) was conquered by the Canaanites and made tributary. The bulk of the people (Jacob) thought

¹ Gen. 27^{39 f.}; cf. v. 29. The text of 40 is apparently corrupt. I have followed Ball with some misgiving. The fact that this last clause was added later (Gunkel) does not interfere with the argument—the clause is quite in the spirit of the context.

themselves not strong enough to avenge the wrong. But two clans were of a different mind. These (Simeon and Levi) formed a treacherous plan by which to release their sister clan. They therefore affected to be satisfied with the new arrangement, and proposed a general alliance with rights of intermarriage on condition that the Canaanites adopt the rite of circumcision. This being agreed to, they fell upon the unsuspecting town when the men were disabled by the operation and massacred the whole male population.¹ The events are represented to us in the story by the acts of the individual sons and daughters of Jacob.

Not many of the Genesis stories are so clearly historical as this one; and those that are historical deal with events of a later time. What interests us here is, first, the fact that the Patriarchs cannot be taken as individuals. If individuals Reuben, Gad, and Judah never existed, it is plain that individuals Jacob, Isaac, and Abraham cannot have any more substantial reality. We have to do here with figures of the poetic or legend-building imagination. After the clans began to be treated as individuals the story-tellers busied themselves lovingly with these interesting figures. They became the heroes of adventure, and the character of the various peoples began to be reflected in their eponyms. The most striking is Jacob. In this cunning adventurer we see the ideals of nomad Israel admirably depicted. When we have ceased to be uneasy at seeing such a character held up as a pattern saint, then we begin to appreciate the skill with which he is described.

A story of this kind is properly called a *saga*. Such sagas circulate orally long before there is any written literature. They are products of the poetic imagination. If one of them has a historical incident as its basis, the incident is transformed. For the most part, however, the interest of the narrator is not historical but social. The picture drawn is one of personal and family life, as we see in the stories of the Patriarchs. "We hear a number of details which, whether we take them for authentic or not, are of no value for [political] history: that Abraham was pious and magnanimous, that he once sent away his concubine to gratify his wife, that Jacob deceived his brother, that Leah and Rachel were jealous of each other—unimportant anecdotes of

¹ The composite nature of the narrative (Gen. 34) is shown by Ball and Gunkel. I have followed what seems to me the older form of the story.

country life, histories of wells, of watering troughs, of the inner chamber, delightful to read but anything rather than historical events." The author from whom I am quoting adds, what is evident on reflection, that whereas in genuine historical tradition we must find a way in which eye-witnesses of the events have communicated their observations to the narrator of the history, in the Patriarchal sagas we have an interval of four hundred years (in any case) between the events and the narrator. It is impossible to suppose that tradition has carefully conserved the smallest details of Patriarchal family life during all this period.¹

At one time there must have existed a great mass of this poetical material. It was in the form of detached stories, each a unit in itself. When a written literature began, the stories had already been grouped in a genealogical scheme. This fact is shown by the plan common to J and E, which plan made it easy to combine the two documents in a single narrative. The original separateness of the sagas is shown by the duplicates which we find in our documents. Thus the prevarication concerning a wife is related once of Abraham and twice of Isaac; the consecration of Bethel is attributed to Abraham and also to Jacob; the name of Beersheba is given by Abraham and also by Isaac.²

Two things strike the attention in considering these stories. The first is, that they have the nomad life as their ideal. No doubt this is a historical recollection—the Israelites were Bedawin before their settlement in Canaan. This they confess by making Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob nomads. The only exception is Isaac, who is represented as sowing and reaping, and who is therefore thought of as beginning the agricultural life. How the Israelite conceived the ideal shepherd is seen in the case of Jacob. His skill in caring for his flocks, his fidelity in watching them by day and by night,³ his shrewdness in dealing with the cunning and covetous Laban, his diplomatic method of conciliating the powerful chieftain Esau after he had twice overreached him—all these show us the shepherd as (according to the conception of the times) he ought to be. The frank worldliness of the

¹ Gunkel, *Genesis*, p. iii. Gunkel's whole introduction (now accessible in English with the title *The Legends of Genesis*) is instructive and valuable.

² The prevarication, Gen. 12¹⁰⁻²⁰, 20, and 26¹⁻¹⁶; Bethel, Gen. 12⁸, 28¹⁰⁻²² and 35¹⁵; Beersheba, Gen. 21²²⁻³¹ and 26²⁶⁻³⁵.

³ Gen. 31³⁸⁻⁴⁰.

story in many of its phases contrasts strangely with the religious tone which runs through it. But this is the nature of early religion—the God who can give success is the God who commands the faith of primitive man. We lose the point of the ancient story when we read into it our own religious ideas.

It follows that the main interest of this material is the picture it gives of the nomad life at its best. Abraham's faith and hospitality have been justly admired in all ages. The contest of cunning between Jacob and Laban is equally vivid, if not equally admirable. The arrogance of the maid-servant who has been promoted to her master's bed; the jealousy of two wives in the same household, and the superstitious means they use to get offspring; the father's indulgence of the son of his favourite and the consequent hatred of the other sons—these are drawn to the life, and show us how things go in polygamous society. Slavery is assumed as a matter of course, and the position which the trusted slave may attain is shown in the story of the wooing of Rebekah, as it is in the story of Joseph in Egypt. That the standard of morality falls short of that which we hold, has already been intimated. Abraham's cowardly denial of his wife is rewarded with flocks and herds; Jacob's hard bargain with his brother and his fraud in the matter of the blessing are nowhere blamed. His dealing with Laban is a case of diamond cut diamond. Rachel's theft of the Teraphim is a matter of amusement to the narrator—the household god is not the object of heartfelt reverence when he can be thus literally sat upon by a woman. Tamar's heroism in securing by fraud the levirate rights which have been withheld from her, doubtless appealed strongly to those who first heard the tale, and the more drastic measures of Lot's daughters also awakened something like admiration. The frankness of the portrayal is equally instructive, whether the characters be real or imaginary. The strong moral sense is evident, though the morality is not that of our time.

The interest of the authors is evidently centred in the land of Palestine. A large number of the stories are intended to account for place names. One is intended to account for the physical conformation of the country—this is the story of the destruction of Sodom. The Dead Sea is a phenomenon calculated to give rise to a saga. Many another lake is supposed to have swallowed up villages or cities, whose towers the boatman thinks he sees be-

neath the waters, whose church bells he seems to hear on a calm evening. The cause of such a catastrophe can be nothing less than the wrath of the gods. In the well-known story of Philemon and Baucis the wrath of the gods is aroused by the inhospitable conduct of the people. The people of Sodom are worse than inhospitable, and the wrath of Yahweh leaves its permanent impress upon the region, in the uncanny Sea with its burned and barren shore. That no marked change in the natural features of the region has taken place within historic times is now generally conceded. The value of the story to us is its abhorrence of the unnatural vices of the Canaanites—vices from which Israel itself was not free.¹

Much interest is shown by our authors in the legends which had gathered around the various sanctuaries of Canaan. We must remember that the worship on every high hill and under every green tree which Jeremiah so earnestly denounces, was for many centuries the established worship in Israel. Hence the religious motive which led the early writers to trace these sanctuaries to Patriarchal consecration. Bethel is one of these holy places. According to one story it was sacred because Abraham had built an altar there. According to another, Jacob had a revelation which showed him there the ladder which was the gate of heaven. A third account makes him receive there a direct promise from Yahweh.² In commemoration of the revelation a *maçseba* or sacred pillar is set up by Jacob, which he regards as the symbol or rather the residence of the divinity—for the stone is called *House-of-God*. We could hardly have a more vivid commentary on the declaration of the Book of the Covenant: "In every place where I bring my name to remembrance I will come to thee and bless thee." In the consciousness of the people, certain places were sacred. Their sacredness was made known by God's bringing Himself to mind in some extraordinary event, an omen or a dream. Where the divine presence was thus made known an altar was erected and a pillar set up. There the people

¹ Compare Judges 19. On similar sagas, Cheyne, in the *New World*, 1892, pp. 236-245; Usener, *Sintflutsagen*, p. 246 f.; Andree, *Flutsagen*, p. 49 f. On the various elements which enter into the Sodom story, Gunkel, *Genesis*, p. 194 f.

² The two accounts of Jacob's dream are now woven into one (J E); cf. the commentaries on Genesis, or Ball's text—Gen. 28. Abraham's altar is mentioned Gen. 12⁸.

came with their tithes; there they celebrated the yearly festivals, poured oil upon the sacred stone, slept under the supernatural influence, hoping to receive a revelation in a dream.¹

The state of things before the eyes of the narrator was this: every village had a sanctuary of this kind, every remarkable tree was regarded as the seat of a divinity, many of the fountains which were a source of blessing to the land were likewise sacred. All this state of things went back to the pre-prophetic stage of religion. Doubtless the sacredness of many of these sites was first attributed to them by the Canaanites. Israel adopted the sanctuaries and consecrated them to Yahweh. And a part of the adoption was effected by connecting them with the Patriarchs. Thus Abraham built many altars in his wanderings. He also planted sacred trees. For the information that he planted a tamarisk at Beersheba *and called there upon the name of Yahweh El-Olam* would be useless unless it meant that the tree was consecrated to the divinity. It can scarcely be accidental, therefore, that Abram has a theophany at the *Oak of the Oracle*, or that his altar is placed by the *Oaks of Mamre*.²

A theophany shows the sacredness of Penuel, and the name of the place (*Face-of-God*) is its memorial. Beer-lahai-roi is a similar locality, though the etymology is obscure. The place where Abraham offered Isaac is another instance—the place was evidently sacred before Abraham was made acquainted with it. A different sort of sanctuary is one where an ancestor or ancestors are buried. Thus the Tomb of Rachel is evidently sacred, for Jacob erected a *maçgeba* there. The interest which originally attached to the Cave of Machpelah is of the same kind. These graves were sanctuaries, and in the early religion of Israel the manes were worshipped at the place of burial.³ Machpelah has continued to

¹ Jacob is the inaugurator of this method of inquiring the divine will. For parallels in other religions see Deubner, *De Incubatione* (1900). On sacred stones or pillars in other religions, see the article *Baitulos* in Roscher, *Lexicon der Griechischen und Römischen Mythologie*, I, p. 746.

² Gen. 12⁶, 13¹⁸, 21³³. On the sanctity of fountains, trees, and hills among the Semitic peoples, cf. Baudissin's essay in his *Studien zur Semitischen Religionsgeschichte*, II, pp. 143–268; and Curtiss's chapter on the High-places in his *Primitive Semitic Religion* (1902).

³ It would seem that a *maçgeba* was also placed upon the grave of Deborah: Gen. 35⁸, continued in v. 14. A survival of the worship of the manes is the reverence paid at the tombs of "saints" all through the East at the

be a sanctuary, as we know, down to the present time. Probably this, like the other sacred places, was originally consecrated to a Canaanitish god. Whether Abraham was originally such a god, may be doubted.¹ The reason why P lays such emphasis upon Machpelah is doubtless that he wished to contradict the Edomite claim to Hebron, which became offensive in the post-exilic period.

The writers we are considering were also especially interested in the possession of Canaan by Israel. They could account for the success of their ancestors in securing so goodly a land only by supposing an act of grace on the part of God. Hence we find frequent emphasis of God's promises to the Patriarchs, His covenant with them, and His protecting care. He causes a terror to fall upon the Canaanites so that they do not pursue Jacob after the massacre at Shechem. He warns Abimelech against trespassing upon Abraham's marital rights. He forbids Laban to do Jacob any harm.² This protecting care is recorded in the names of some of the characters—Ishmael is so called because his prayer (or that of his mother) is heard. The birth of Ishmael, Isaac, Esau, Jacob is due to especial divine favour, because the wives of the Patriarchs were barren. Most impressive of all is the nearness of Yahweh to His clients. He comes to them frequently in dreams or theophanies. He makes and repeats promises of protection and prosperity. He enters into solemn covenant with Abraham, condescending to the methods by which human contracts are ratified, and the promise is repeated to Isaac and Jacob. For Abraham's sake Lot is rescued in the destruction of Sodom. Even the prevarication in the matter of Sarah is made an occasion for blessing the Patriarch—the sincerity of the author's religion does not, of course, excuse his defective moral sense.

Historically it was a puzzle that Lot, the nephew of Abraham, should be separated from Israel by the Dead Sea. The saga of present day. A considerable literature might be cited on the subject of animism in the religion of Israel. The most recent monographs to date are Frey, *Tod, Seelenglaube und Seelenkult im alten Israel* (1898); and Grüneisen, *Der Ahnenkultus und die Urreligion Israels* (1900).

¹ As we are here considering only the Patriarchal stories, a complete enumeration of the early sanctuaries is not attempted. A copious list is given by Freiherr von Gall, *Altisraelitische Kultstätten* (1898).

² Gen. 20³⁻⁷, 31²⁹, 35⁵.

the destruction of Sodom is made to account for the situation. Esau was the older brother of Jacob—why should he have the less desirable country? The saga accused him of selling his birth-right, or told how Jacob was shrewd enough to cheat him of the blessing. The dismissal of Ishmael and of the sons of Keturah to the Arabian wilderness confirms Jacob's title to the country. Jacob's covenant with Laban seems to embody the idea that Israelites and Arameans should respect the boundary cairn in Gilead and live in peace with each other. Isaac's treaty with the Philistines secures the title to some wells in the South Country. Abraham's purchase of Machpelah and Jacob's purchase of land at Shechem are designed to authenticate the title of their descendants.

Care for purity of blood was early reinforced by religious motives. From this point of view we understand Abraham's anxiety to secure one of his kinswomen as a wife for Isaac. The same motive sends Jacob to Laban. It seems a little curious that Tamar the Canaanitess should be made so prominent—we can account for the prominence only by supposing that her loyalty to duty made her worthy to rank with the best of Israel's mothers. A reaction against Canaanitish religion is perhaps seen in the story of the sacrifice of Isaac, for the lesson of the story in its present form is that Yahweh does not require sacrifice of the first-born, but accepts an animal instead.

What has been said is enough to show that we have no really historical knowledge of a patriarchal period preceding Israel's conquest of Canaan. The individuals, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, are eponyms—personifications of clans, tribes, or ethnological groups—and they are nothing more. But, as the religious mind is reluctant to give up the flesh and blood reality of these figures, it may repay us to review the evidence once more. The following positions seem to be established:

The earliest literature we have is conscious that the sons of Israel of which it speaks (Reuben, Judah, and the others) are only personifications of the tribes which inhabit Canaan. But if these are personifications, then *a fortiori* Israel himself is a personification, and the more remote ancestors can have no more substantial existence than the nearer one.

The state of the country, indicated by the patriarchal stories, is contrary to fact. The only immigration possible in the Amarna

period, was a warlike invasion, such as actually took place at the conquest—not a peaceable sojourn like that of Abraham.

The nature of the information given by the stories is such that we cannot suppose it handed down by any valid historical process—family gossip known only to the immediate members of the family does not pass accurately from one generation to another for six hundred years or more.

The stories we are considering are parallel to folk-stories which are preserved to us in other regions—aetiological legends, sagas, poetic transformations of historical events. The religious imagination especially delights in such compositions.

Arab usage is in line with what we are here assuming for Israel. The clan is spoken of as an individual, its members are hissons, related clans are his brothers or sisters, the alliance of two clans is presented as a marriage, the larger group of which the clan is a part is called the father or grandfather (sometimes the mother or grandmother) of the clans of which it is made up. On the ground of this analogy we should be justified in making the wives of the Patriarchs into clans or groups of clans. So the sons of Rachel are the two tribes Joseph and Benjamin; Rachel herself is simply the earlier tribe which divided into two; Joseph, as we know, afterward subdivided into Ephraim and Manasseh.

Biblical usage is quite clear in regard to the name Israel, which in an overwhelming number of cases is used as the name of the nation. Jacob is the synonym of Israel, and in the earlier literature occurs in the poetic passages almost exclusively.

This brings us to a significant fact; the importance of the Patriarchs as individual figures dates from the post-exilic, or at least post-Deuteronomic, period. We can see that it was natural for the people, in times of reversal, and when their hold on their homeland was precarious, to emphasize the promises made to the forefathers. The significance of these men increases, therefore, in the post-exilic period, and down to the New Testament times. A striking fact is, that none of the prophets allude to Abraham until we come to Ezekiel.¹ The weight of this in an inquiry into the historicity of the Patriarchs can hardly be overestimated.

The fact is, that a single sentence in the account of Abraham appealed to the Apostle Paul, and the Patriarch thus became an

¹ The present text shows two passages, Mic. 7²⁰ and Jer. 33²⁶, but both are in confessedly late additions to the prophetic text.

important figure in Christian theology. Recent authors who attempt to rescue the historicity of the Father of the Faithful are obliged to make so many modifications in their account of him, that they deprive us of his religious value.¹

Our conclusion is that there is no sufficient warrant for supposing individuals Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob to have been the ancestors of the people. That Jacob or Israel was the name of a clan (or that they were the names of two separate clans) seems to be made out. Isaac and Abraham are as yet unaccounted for—that is, we know of no tribes or clans that bore these names. Probably both were creations of the legend-building imagination working under the necessities of the patriarchal theory. Isaac represents the unity of Israel and Edom; Abraham represents a larger unity—the early Israelites were conscious of their relationship with Moab, Ammon, Ishmael, Midian, Edom, and other tribes of the region. This implies that all these peoples had a common

¹ Cornill, in his recently published sketch of the history of Israel, assumes that the Semitic migration from Mesopotamia about 1500 B.C. was headed by a chieftain named Abraham. This author seems to be conscious that it is illogical to assert the historicity of Abraham while sacrificing that of Isaac and Jacob (*Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, p. 30). In fact, the Abraham of such a hypothesis is not the Abraham of our Bibles, and to recover the name of a single chieftain in the great migration must be confessed to be a matter of minor importance. Paton supposes Abram and Abraham to have been two distinct individuals (*Early History of Syria and Palestine*, p. 41 f.). Abram he supposes to have been a chieftain of the Amorites who migrated to Palestine about 2250 B.C. Ryle (in Hastings, *Dictionary of the Bible*, s. v.) also regards Abraham as leader of a great nomadic movement, but regards his story as mainly a picture of the relationship of Arab tribes and clans to the Hebrew stock. Kent (*History of the Hebrew People*, I, p. 11) speaks only of the traditions of the Patriarchs as patron saints. Other recent historians prefer to pass very lightly over the stories of the Patriarchs, and to begin their narratives with the sojourn in Egypt, for example Budde, *Religion of Israel*; Otteley, *Short History of the Hebrews*. I have cited what may fairly be called conservative scholars, so that the reader may have a fair view of the consensus of opinion. Wade (*Old Testament History*) finds it difficult to regard the patriarchal records, taken as a whole, as completely trustworthy, but believes many of the figures in them to be real characters. On the other hand, Winckler (*Geschichte Israels*, II, pp. 23 f., 28) finds in Abraham the moon-god, or Tammuz (Adonis) the son of the moon-god, and finds this theory confirmed by Gen. 14, which he thinks a Babylonian myth. Renan, *History of the People of Israel*, I, p. 63) represents an older stage of speculation when he identifies Abraham with the *pater Orchemus* (Ab-Orcham) of early mythology, whose name is preserved to us by Ovid.

ancestor. A natural name for such an ancestor would be *Father-of-a-crowd-of-nations*, which the Hebrew author thinks to be the meaning of the name Abraham. The precarious nature of Biblical etymologies is admitted on all hands. But until a more probable derivation for the name Abraham is put forward, we may accept this one. In this case Abraham is a genealogical construction originating in the necessities of the early theory of history. It is possible that the other name of the Patriarch, Abram, which means *Exalted-Father*, is a similar invention intended to mean *Great Ancestor*.

It is not strictly correct to say that the sagas give us no historical results. What they reveal to us is this: the group of peoples of which Israel was one were immigrants from the East; they were nomads till they settled in Palestine; they amalgamated more or less thoroughly with the Canaanites. If these results seem meagre we must remember that literature has other than a directly historical value. Abraham as a type of the believer in God reveals the religious faith of the author who drew his picture. The manners, morals, and religion of the Patriarchs really existed in the Israel of a later period. The authors who could charm us with the story of Joseph have established **their** kinship with universal human nature.

CHAPTER IV

EGYPT AND THE DESERT

As every reader of the Bible knows, the received history of Israel makes Jacob and his family go down to Egypt to the number of seventy souls. Here they are nourished during the famine and establish themselves in the land. During the years of Joseph's life they prosper and increase. Change of dynasty (so we may interpret) puts them into the power of a king who has no feelings of gratitude toward Joseph, and who fears the power of the growing people. His fear that they may make an alliance with future invaders (from Syria, of course) makes him take extraordinary measures to check their growth. He reduces them to forced labour, putting them at the hard work of making bricks. This measure proves unavailing, and he is driven to more drastic expedients, nothing less than the slaying of all male infants as soon as born or in the act of birth. During the time when this cruel decree is in force Moses is born. After exposure by his mother he is discovered and adopted by Pharaoh's daughter. When grown to manhood his too lively sympathy with his oppressed brethren brings him into danger and results in his flight to Midian. Here, after some time, he is commissioned to deliver his people. His demand for their liberation is repeatedly refused, but the refusal is in each case followed by a signal manifestation of the divine wrath. The culmination is the death of the first-born in every Egyptian family, under the impression of which the people are thrust out. But the quick change of mind on the part of the king threatens to undo what has been done, especially as the fugitives get "entangled in the land." The new perplexity is solved, however, by a new deliverance, and an added stroke is inflicted upon the oppressor.

The crossing of the Red Sea opens the era of the desert wanderings. The immediate dearth of food is met by a miraculous supply; the equally trying lack of water is overcome by a similar act of God. The Bedawin dispute the way, but are successfully

overcome. At the Mount of God a covenant is ratified amid convulsions of nature. The Book of the Covenant is adopted, only to be immediately forgotten by the people. The command for the erection of the Tabernacle is given with great particularity, but is interrupted by the trying incident of the golden calf. A new decalogue, different from the one given forty days or eighty days earlier, is engraved on tables of stone. After vengeance is taken for the crime of idolatry an elaborate ritual law is given to Moses. The people then journey to Kadesh, on the southern border of Palestine, where they sojourn for a long time.

The narrative thus summarised is in many places confused and over-full. Its numerical data are exaggerated and impossible. Its contradictions and inconsistencies have often been pointed out. The careful reader will discover that in the narrative as it stands, Moses goes up to the mountain as many as seven times. He will discover also frequent duplicates, such as the revelation of the divine Name, Ex. 3⁹⁻¹⁵ and 6²⁻⁹. In some cases a section is injected into the narrative in such a way as to break asunder what was once continuous; so the little paragraph of the circumcision, 4²⁴⁻²⁶, and the genealogy which ends "this is that Moses and Aaron," 6²⁶. As in the earlier narratives that we have examined, these phenomena indicate composite origin. Rightly to estimate the material we must endeavour to separate the documents. In this endeavour we shall discover that the most glaring improbabilities are the property of the priestly writer—his disregard of limitations of space and time are evident in this as in other parts of his work. It is his love of symmetry which divides Moses's life into three equal periods of forty years each. He it is who dates the exodus four hundred and thirty years to a day from the immigration of Jacob and his sons. He it is, also, who not only gives the number of six hundred thousand adult males for Israel, but confirms these figures by an elaborate census of the twelve tribes.¹

¹ The numerical impossibilities of the narrative are set forth by Colenso in the first volume of his *Pentateuch and Book of Joshua Critically Examined*, London, 1862. On the method of desert travelling notice Doughty, *Arabia Deserta*, I, pp. 7 and 61. Professor George F. Moore has called my attention to Ibn Chaldûn's criticism of the figures given by Masûdi in his history of the exodus, which were borrowed, of course, from Jewish sources.

This late document being laid aside, we may suppose that the other authors thought of the people who left Egypt as being comparatively a small number.¹ There is, of course, no historical improbability in a nomad clan's taking refuge in Egypt, especially in the land of Goshen, which bordered on the desert and was suitable for pastoral life. The Bedawin have always looked with longing eyes (as all history shows) at the rich pastures of Egypt. The tradition of Abraham's going there to sojourn, the Ishmaelite or Midianite caravans that traded thither, show how accessible the country was. To guard against too frequent or too violent incursions of this kind, the Egyptian monarchs early fortified the isthmus of Suez. To pass the fortifications required the permission of the authorities; with good reason, therefore, the story makes Joseph ask leave of the Pharaoh for the settlement of his brothers. In the Egyptian monuments we have record of an Edomite tribe asking and receiving permission to pass the fortifications in order to pasture their cattle on the land of Pharaoh.² In fact it was the most natural thing in the world for the nomads to be attracted to Egypt, especially from Beersheba and the South Country.

But the Egyptologists as yet have discovered on the monuments no evidence of a Joseph or an Israel in Egypt, as they have discovered none of the oppression or the exodus. We are therefore obliged to look narrowly at the evidence of the Hebrew sources. Here we might plead the tradition of Abraham's visit just alluded to, of Isaac's sojourn in the land of the Philistines (which may have been tributary to Egypt), of Joseph's being sold to an Egyptian courtier, and finally in all three documents the extended account of the sojourn and deliverance. We may acknowledge

Cf. Ibn Chaldûn's *Prolegomena* (1311), p. 6 f. The analysis of the Hexateuch is attempted in works already cited, to which may be added Bacon's *Triple Tradition of the Exodus*, Hartford, 1894.

¹ Some critics do indeed attribute to J the statement (Ex. 12 37) that "Israel journeyed from Rameses to Succoth, about six hundred thousand footmen, besides children." But the verse is suspicious. Baentsch ascribes it to P (*Exodus*, p. 104), while Holzinger (*Exodus*, p. 35) and Addis think the original number has been enlarged; so apparently Carpenter and Battersby, *Hexateuch*, II, p. 98.

² W. M. Müller, *Asien und Europa nach Altägyptischen Denkmälern* (1893), p. 135. The Bedawin are here called *clans of Edom*. A reference to the Seirites is given in the same connexion.

the historic probability, also, that a tribe once within the power of the Pharaoh should be forced on to the public works, and should make a successful revolt. On the other hand, we must not seek confirmation for the Biblical story at the hand of Manetho.¹ His account is to the effect that at one time Egypt was invaded by foreigners who established themselves in a city called Avaris, and kept the power five hundred years. After this time they were expelled, and to the number of two hundred and forty thousand journeyed through the wilderness from Egypt to Syria. Here from fear of the Assyrians they built a city large enough to contain so many myriads of men and called it Jerusalem. These foreigners he calls Hyksos.² What foreign dynasties ruled in Egypt does not concern us here. All we need to notice is that Manetho, writing in the Greek period, was influenced by current tradition derived from the Jews, when he made the expelled Hyksos go to Palestine and build Jerusalem. Another story cited from Manetho identifies the Israelites with the lepers and unclean whom an Egyptian king set to work in the quarries. These unfortunates were led to revolt by one Osarsiph, a priest who was among them. Their temporary triumph was due to an alliance with the Hyksos of Jerusalem, and their final expulsion brought them to that city. It must be evident that no use can be made of this legend in a history of Israel. The story seems to be a pure invention, prompted by Egyptian hatred for the Jews.

As external sources fail us we turn again to the Biblical narrative. The unhistorical scheme of the priestly writer being left aside, we examine the story of J and E. Beyond the statement that the small clan of Jacob went to Egypt and remained there three generations, that they were forced to labour on the public works, and that they succeeded in regaining the wilderness under the leadership of Moses, we find little that commands our confidence. That the Egyptian authorities should want to keep them in the land is probable enough. That the oppression was mo-

¹ See Josephus, *Against Apion*, I, 14, 15, 26-31. The credibility of Manetho is discussed at length by Hengstenberg, *Die Bücher Mose's und Egypten* (1841), pp. 236-277. The latest treatment of the story is by Willrich, *Juden und Griechen vor der Makkabäischen Erhebung* (1895), pp. 53-56.

² *Bedawin kings* or *shepherd kings* is Manetho's translation, which seems to be correct; cf. Müller, *Asien und Europa*, p. 132.

tived by fear is hardly likely—fear would have led to their expulsion beyond the fortifications.¹

As we have had occasion to notice, the tradition behind the two documents we are considering is one. The two writers follow substantially the same order of events. But differences of detail show how far the tradition was from being fixed. For example, one document makes the people of Israel settled by themselves in the district of Goshen. The other thinks of them as living in the cities (or a city) in close contact with their Egyptian neighbours, from whom they can borrow jewels at short notice. One knows of Moses's exposure, rescue, and adoption in the family of Pharaoh.² The other seems to have introduced him abruptly into the narrative when already a man. Both, however, know of his flight into Midian, and account for it by an abortive attempt to help his brethren.³ Both make him receive a revelation of Yahweh in the desert, though one supposes that the *name* Yahweh had been before unknown, while the other thinks of it as known from antediluvian times.⁴ One of the sources gives Aaron to Moses as his helper; the other seems not to have known him. One makes Moses receive a magic wand from Yahweh Himself at the Bush, and by means of this he works the miracles. The other narrates that the miracles are announced by Moses, but wrought by the direct act of God.

It is altogether probable that the sources are right in dating a religious epoch from the exodus. The religious motive is so interwoven with the life of Israel that each popular movement was a religious movement. The enthusiasm of a prophet alone seems able to nerve an oriental people to a great effort. This is well illustrated in the co-operation of Moses and Aaron: Moses is told that he shall be a god to Aaron and that Aaron will be his prophet.

¹ That part of the isthmus of Suez which was not rendered impassable by marshes or lakes was defended by a wall and garrison, as already noted.

² A curious parallel to the exposure of Moses in a basket is found in the annals of Sargon I. Cf. McCurdy, *History, Prophecy, and the Monuments*, I, p. 99, and *Keilinschr. Bibliothek*, III, pp. 101–103.

³ So we must suppose, though the attempt as related by J has been lost in the process of combining the documents.

⁴ According to J (Gen. 4²⁶) the name Yahweh was known to Enosh, the grandson of Adam. The theory of E that it was revealed first to Moses is quite clear from Ex. 3¹³.

The commanding position of the recipient of a divine revelation is nowhere more strikingly set forth. How Moses came into this position we can no longer certainly make out. That in his desert wandering he heard a divine voice, and had a theophany of flame, is not without parallel.¹ Elijah also had a revelation at Mount Horeb, and John the Baptist received his call in a wilderness sojourn. In what connexion the new name of Yahweh stands with the Midianites, among whom Moses sojourns, is not clear. The most obvious hypothesis is that Yahweh was the ancestral God of Midian, with whom Moses became acquainted, faith in whom led to the endeavour to deliver Israel. The name *Yahweh* gives no light on the problem.²

A distinct section of the narrative is concerned with the plagues sent upon Egypt by Yahweh. In the current text these are ten in number, but the analysis shows that no single source had so many. All of them (except the death of the first-born) are such visitations as the land of Egypt is subject to from its situation and climate.³ Their object is variously given by the different writers. One assumes that they are to punish Pharaoh's refusal to let the people go; another makes them demonstrations of the power of Yahweh; the third presents them as stages in the contest between Yahweh and the gods of Egypt. The earliest document (J) makes the plagues seven in number: an epidemic among the fish of the Nile, an enormous number of frogs, swarms of flies, a murrain among cattle, a violent hail, an invasion of locusts, and the death of the first-born. The narrative of E duplicates the hail, the locusts, and the death of the first-born, and adds the turning of the Nile into blood and the darkness, both which seem to have a basis in the natural phenomena of the country.

¹ One is reminded of the sidra tree of Mohammed—Koran 53¹⁴.

² The etymology of Ex. 3¹⁴ expresses only the view of the writer, and can hardly put us into possession of the real meaning of a name so ancient. Besides this, the author's language is obscure, so that we do not know whether he meant to predicate of Yahweh self-existence (uncaused), self-determination, sovereignty, or unsearchableness. Conjectures are recorded in many commentaries and Biblical theologies, the latest to date by Holzinger (*Exodus*, p. 13 f.) and Baentsch (*Exodus*, p. 23).

³ This is well brought out by an article, "Die Plagen Egyptens," in the *Christliche Welt*, X (1896), No 45. The author shows also, that the sequence of the plagues is that in which the natural phenomena come in the Egyptian seasons.

The red colour of the Nile at the opening of the inundation is one of the things which impress every observer. The darkness may be an exaggeration of the sand-storms which obscure the atmosphere. P chooses only a part of those narrated by his predecessors and makes a change in two of them to increase their efficacy.¹ Both J and P make the death of the first-born the occasion for instituting the passover festival.

The endeavour has often been made to defend the Mosaic authorship of the account by showing its intimate acquaintance with things Egyptian. To appreciate the real force of this argument we must remember the relation in which Palestine always stood to Egypt. We might compare it to the relation of Wales to England or of Switzerland to France. Canaan, as the smaller country, always looked up to Egypt as its powerful neighbour. Egyptian influence always extended thither. Often Egypt was the real or nominal possessor of the country. An Egyptian party was always found at the court of Israel. There is no period of the history, therefore, in which an intelligent Israelite could be ignorant of Egyptian conditions and Egyptian customs. Doubtless a journey to Egypt was made by every man that travelled from Palestine for business, education, or pleasure. When we consider these facts, the wonder is that the Pentateuch knows so little of things Egyptian. The Pharaohs of the narrative are all called Pharaoh, but no one of them is brought before us by his individual name. This is in striking contrast with the later historical books of the Canon, which know quite well their Shishak, Necho, and Hophra. Here we ask in vain even for the dynasty to which Joseph's patron belonged, or to which belonged the oppressor and the father of Moses's adopted mother. The contest between Yahweh and the Egyptian gods is referred to, but no one of these gods is brought before us by name. The peculiarities of the Egyptian religion are so marked, and its contrasts to the religion of Israel are so violent, that we never cease to wonder at the reticence of the authors. How easy it would have been for them to show by a concrete example the impotence of Apis and Mnevis! The ram of Mendes, the crocodiles of Ombos,

¹ The flies become to him *gnats*; the murrain on cattle is changed to boils (? small-pox) among men. On the differences between the documents in the matter of the plagues, cf. Briggs, *Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch* (1897), p. 148.

the obelisks and statues of the various temples might be made to point a contrast between the God of Israel and the objects of Egyptian blind devotion, such as would adorn the tale as well as point a much-needed moral for times to come. But we read nothing of this kind. In a writer who had lived in the midst of these abominations¹ this would be incomprehensible. The absence of local colour evident in every chapter of the narrative, then, forbids us to attribute these documents to an author brought up in Egypt. And when we look at those resemblances between Egyptian and "Mosaic" institutions which have been industriously collected and persistently urged, we find that they are no more than are discovered in comparing the religion of Israel with other early religions.

It is easy to show that at other points than religion, the Hebrew author had naïve conceptions of things Egyptian. We can hardly suppose that the Pharaoh ever lived in so little state as to be accessible to Moses and Aaron whenever they chose to seek an interview. Was the capital ever at Rameses or Succoth—or did the king come thither to oversee the Israelite labour? Did the Princess Royal regularly take her bath in the Nile? Does the Nile flow through the land of Goshen? Such questions readily suggest themselves. The difficulty in answering them shows that we have to do with a picture many of whose details are drawn from the writer's imagination rather than from his knowledge of Egypt. Examination of the proper names which occur in the narrative shows us scarcely any that are necessarily Egyptian. That of Moses himself is usually so classed. But the Hebrew narrator did not so regard it, for he gives it a Hebrew etymology.² In the genealogies of P we do find an occasional Egyptian name; thus Aaron's son Eleazar marries the daughter of a man with an Egyptian name, and he calls his son also by an

¹ The puzzling expression in Ex. 8²⁶, *for we shall sacrifice the abomination of the Egyptians*, may show that the author knew of Egyptian worship of bulls and rams, for these were the sacrificial animals of Israel. Did he perhaps write, *we shall sacrifice the gods of the Egyptians*? This would best suit the context, and a zealous scribe might readily substitute the word that better expressed his own feelings.

² The name is undoubtedly older than the story of the daughter of Pharaoh. It does not seem violent, therefore, to revive a conjecture now discredited, that it was given to Moses as the *Deliverer* (literally *Drawer-out* of his people).

Egyptian name.¹ In the same connexion we find a name which may be that of the Egyptian god Osiris. But these indications in the latest of our documents cannot be made the basis of an argument. Finally, the absence of any conception of Egyptian history, its successive dynasties, its relations with Canaan and the Sinaitic peninsula, points in the same direction.²

The climax of the story is the crossing of the Red Sea. But the narrative here shows the same perplexing combination of different features that we have met in the earlier account. P, with the exactness of detail that marks his narrative elsewhere, makes the people march from Rameses to Succoth, thence to Etham in the edge of the wilderness; then they make a sharp turn and camp by the sea before Pi-hahiroth, between Migdol and the sea opposite Baal Zephon.³ Unfortunately our knowledge of the localities is not sufficient to enable us to identify the route thus marked out. That it is intended to emphasise the miracle by bringing Israel into a situation from which escape seems impossible, is evident. The result will be the greater glory to Yahweh. The older documents are much less definite. The earliest one (J) simply tells us that Israel marched to the border with the pillar of cloud before them. When Pharaoh discovered that they were leaving the land with no purpose of returning, he pursued with his army. To relieve the terror of Israel the pillar of cloud guarded the rear against the approaching enemy. Meanwhile a strong wind was driving back the waters of the sea so that in the morning the bed of the sea was dry. The destruction

¹ *Putiel* and *Phinehas*, Ex. 6²⁵. The name Phinehas occurs again in the family of Eli. Whatever Egyptian influence may have been at work in the period of Samuel there can be, here, no question of an Egyptian sojourn (1 Sam. 1³).

² The reader may consult an article by Professor Toy in the *New World* for 1893, pp. 121-141. The Egyptian features of the Pentateuch have been diligently emphasised by scholars, either to prove the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch or to disprove the originality of the Mosaic revelation. Especially persistent has been the attempt to connect Hebrew and Egyptian religion. The earlier essays of the kind were laboriously refuted by Witsius in his *Ægyptiaca* (Amsterdam, 1696), and his contention has been upheld by recent investigation. On Egyptian religion, cf. Wiedemann, *Religion of the Ancient Egyptians* (1897).

³ Ex. 14¹⁻³. The account intimates that the route was one not natural for the people to take, and that the purpose was to entice Pharaoh to destruction.

of the Egyptians was accomplished by the returning flood tide. It is vain to inquire for the particular point at which this author supposed the crossing to take place. The great variety of theories that have been held shows the insufficiency of the data.¹ That no actual occurrence lies at the basis of the account would be too much to say. In the present state of our knowledge we cannot make a more definite statement about it than this: Early Hebrew tradition relates a sojourn in Egypt and a remarkable deliverance under Moses. The Song of Deliverance is a late insertion in the text, and besides adds nothing to the prose description.

The object of bringing Israel out of Egypt is that they may worship at the Mount of God where Moses had his revelation. There seems no reason to doubt that this was the point, three days' journey in the wilderness, to visit which Pharaoh's consent was asked by Moses. The perplexity which has compassed our efforts to define the events of the exodus is still encountered as we inquire for the site of this mountain. At least three sacred spots are named at which Israel met its God. These are Sinai, Horeb, and Kadesh. That Sinai and Horeb are different names for the same mountain is possible, but when we observe that the two names characterise different documents we are led to suspect that they were originally different places which have been forcibly brought into connexion in the process of uniting the traditions into one story. As in other cases, the most circumstantial narrative is the one which is latest in order of time.

It is significant that one of the oldest fragments continues the account by adding immediately after the crossing of the Sea: "Then Moses made the Benê Israel march from the Red Sea, and they went forth into the Wilderness of Shur and marched three

¹ It is in itself suspicious that the youngest document should have the most detailed information. Our one fixed point is the uniform tradition that Israel was settled in Goshen. This district is clearly identified as the eastern part of the present *Wadi Tumilat*. Rameses seems to have been at the western end of this district. Etham will then be a point at the eastern end "in the edge of the desert." The present tendency is to identify Pithom and Etham. Pi-hahiroth, Migdol, and Baal Zephon are, however, still obscure. Careful articles on the Exodus and Goshen are given by Hastings's *Dictionary of the Bible* and the *Encyclopædia Biblica*. The localities are treated also in the commentaries and in numerous other works; compare the references in the articles just named.

days in the Wilderness without finding water." The Wilderness of Shur is known to us as the district lying immediately east of the isthmus of Suez. It is evidently the thought of the author that the Israelites marched straight eastward. The objective point in his narrative has been displaced in the compilation, but we can hardly doubt that it was Kadesh. It is significant, also, that at Marah, after the sweetening of the water "He gave him statutes and judgments, and there He tested him." This was precisely what was done at Sinai, according to the received account. It does not seem violent to suppose that this earliest writer meant by Marah, whose waters were sweetened, the fountain of Kadesh, but that the name Kadesh has been excluded from the narrative in the interest of harmony. The clause *there He tested him* is an evident allusion to the testing which gave its name to the place Massah. But Massah is identified with Meribah,¹ which is certainly at Kadesh. On the ground of these indications we are justified in assuming that the earliest traditions made Israel journey from Egypt directly to Kadesh. There they sojourned for a considerable time, Moses acting as their oracle and leader, and thence they made the first attack upon Canaan. Kadesh is in fact the only point in the whole region where a considerable clan can find sustenance for its flocks. We may easily suppose that the earliest narrative made Amalek dispute the possession of this oasis with Israel.²

In favour of Kadesh as the original sanctuary we may quote the following passage from the Song of Moses in Deuteronomy:

"Yahweh came from Sinai
And beamed forth unto them from Seir:
He shone forth from Paran
And came from Meribath Kadesh."³

¹ Ex. 17 ¹⁻³. The location of Meribah in Kadesh is well established by Num. 20 ¹³, 27 ¹⁴, Ezek. 47 ¹⁹, 48 ²⁸.

² Rephidim, where Amalek fought with Israel (Ex. 17 ⁸⁻¹⁶), is mentioned in direct connexion with Massah and Meribah. Perhaps too much stress should not be laid upon Judges 11 ¹⁶, where the interpolator gives Egypt, the Red Sea, and Kadesh as the three stations of the wanderings of Israel, making no mention of Sinai.

³ It is admitted by recent commentators that *Meribath Kadesh* is the original reading of the last two words. With this verse (Deut. 33 ²) compare 32 ⁵¹. Dillmann in his commentary refers to Ewald, who claims (*Jahrbücher der Bibl. Wissenschaft*, III, p. 234) to have discovered the reading *many* years before 1851.

The verse looks like an attempt to combine various traditions concerning the ancient residence of Israel's God. Kadesh is the climax of the verse, and while we might account for the mention of Sinai and Seir as indicating the general region from which Yahweh approached Palestine, Kadesh can be brought in only because of a definite tradition connected with it.

In the Ode of Deborah the seat of Yahweh from which He comes to rescue His people is *Seir* and the *field of Edom*.¹ It is possible that we have here an entirely divergent tradition. But, on the other hand, it is possible that the field of Edom once extended so far westward as to include Kadesh. Without laying too much stress upon this, we should not forget that the rock from which Moses brought water is at Kadesh, according to the original tradition in both forms.² This tradition is in fact a legend which arose in connexion with the sacred fountain. For at Kadesh a copious spring gushes forth from the base of a small hill of solid rock. In accordance with ancient Semitic religion such a spring and the rock from which it issues would certainly be held sacred.³

Moses established his clan here, himself acting as minister of the oracle. At this stage of religious development every God assists his worshippers by revelations. And these revelations concern the practical affairs of life. Disputes between tribesmen were settled by "bringing them before God." Hence the sanctuaries of repute always have a priest whose business it is to receive and transmit the decisions of the divinity. In one of our accounts Moses is represented as hearing and deciding cases from morning to evening. This function belongs to him because he

¹ Judges, 5⁴. The mention of Sinai in the next verse seems to be an interpolation; cf. Moore and Budde on the passage.

² Ex. 17⁶ mentions Horeb, but this is an interpolation, as is shown by Baentsch (*Handkommentar*). The parallel account, Num. 20¹⁻⁵, locates the event at Kadesh.

³ On Kadesh we have the elaborate monograph, *Kadesh Barnea*, by Trumbull (1884), where earlier authorities are discussed. The description of Rowlands is there quoted in full (p. 214 f.), and confirmed by Trumbull's own observation (p. 273). On sacred fountains among the Semites, cf. Baudissin, *Studien zur Semit. Religionsgeschichte*, II, pp. 143-183. The Kenites with whom, according to one document, Moses was affiliated by marriage, certainly dwelt in the region of Kadesh, and Amalek, with whom Israel had a feud from the time of the Wandering, also belongs in the vicinity.

has the counsel of Yahweh. The Hebrew word for priest shows that the man so designated was the organ of divine revelations. The irony of history is illustrated when the later writers deny the priesthood to Moses. It is not difficult to suppose that the fountain of Kadesh received its name *Fountain of Decision* because of this oracle administered by Moses. Further evidence of Moses's connexion with Kadesh may be found in the fact that his Kenite father-in-law was at home in this region.¹

While this is the oldest tradition concerning the desert sojourn, there can be no doubt that other accounts named Sinai and Horeb as sacred mountains. In a region like the Sinaitic peninsula we should be surprised not to find a number of peaks viewed as seats of divinities. Nothing in our documents compels us to suppose Horeb and Sinai to be the same, or to make one name refer to the group and the other to a single peak. The elaborate attempts which have been made to fix upon one of the mountains in the Sinaitic group as the Mount of the Law are based upon the assumption that the data of P may be taken for history. When we surrender these data we are left with only the vaguest intimations. In the verse quoted above, Sinai is associated with Seir, Paran, and Kadesh. In sharp contrast with this conception is the one which identifies Sinai with a peak in Midian. Midian, so far as we know, always occupied the territory east of the Aelanitic gulf. The Mount of God at which Moses received his call is put by E on the western edge of this district.² As the mountain is also called Horeb by E, we can hardly help seeing here the same general view which, in relating the life of Elijah, makes him travel forty days from Beersheba to Horeb. But it is hopeless to try to reconcile this with the statement in our Deuteronomy that there are eleven days from Horeb to Kadesh Barnea. The latter statement again throws no light upon the Deuteronomist's location of Horeb. The divergence of the traditions must be evident, and this divergence is just what we should expect in documents of different ages, all of them some centuries removed from the events which they treat.

And if the chief points are so uncertain, it is clear that no satisfactory identification of the itinerary of the wandering can be

¹ Kadesh is apparently more than three days' march from Egypt. But it is impossible to base an argument on this till we know where the three days' march into the desert was to start from.

² Ex. 3¹.

hoped for. The attempts hitherto made have gone on the hypothesis that all the statements of the Biblical text are equally reliable.¹ Thus there has grown up a tradition that the Israelites crossed the Red Sea at Suez, moved down the east shore of the Gulf of Suez to what is now known as Wadi Feiran, and then turned into the mountains, camping in the valley Er-Raha "before the Mount." This is doubtless the route which the traveller would take to reach the site which monkish tradition has fixed upon as sacred. But it must be remembered that the southern end of the peninsula is a mass of mountains, among which no single peak has claims to pre-eminence. That a caravan of even fifteen hundred people (which some regard as the original clan of Israel) could not find water on this road and that its cattle could not subsist there even in the spring—these are grave objections to the hypothesis. And when we seek for historical evidence we find none. Few of the names given in the Hebrew narrative have survived, a fact which can hardly surprise us when we remember that they are names of nomadic encampments merely. Those which are descriptive might be applied to different places—*Marah*, for example, would describe almost any of the springs or wells in the region, for almost all the water is brackish. But the most discouraging fact is the one already noted, that the detailed list of encampments is the work of the latest author in point of time, and is the product of his impossible theory of the wandering.

Before we can correctly estimate the force of what has been said, we must recall to mind that the nation which reached its highest prosperity under Solomon was made by the combination of many different elements. No more than a fraction of Israel ever sojourned in the wilderness of Kadesh. That a fraction, and an important fraction, did so sojourn is clear from more than one indication. The story of the wandering is one indication. Another is the sense of kinship with Esau (Edom), Moab, Ammon, Midian, and Ishmael. The population of Arabia has always

¹ Modern descriptions of the peninsula begin with Burckhardt, *Travels in Syria and the Holy Land* (1822). The most elaborate attempts at identification were made by Robinson, *Biblical Researches*, Vol. I (Second Edition, 1856). Compare also Palmer, *Desert of the Exodus* (1872), and Trumbull, *Kadesh Barnea*. Recent commentaries on the Pentateuchal books discuss the various hypotheses.

pressed northward toward Syria. We may readily suppose—in fact it is difficult to suppose anything else—that these tribes (Esau, Moab, and Ammon) were a part of the great Arabic migration. The sojourners at Kadesh were in fact Edomite clans which were afterward a part of Judah, and so finally incorporated with Israel. Our sources, however, do not recognise a North Arabian kingdom of Muḥri of which much is now said.

The importance of this fraction of Israel is seen in the impress which their institutions made upon the nation of which they became a part.¹ The desert has always favoured the tribal organisation of society, and this social organisation was so firmly fixed by the desert sojourn that it lasted in Israel long after the adoption of the agricultural life.² The dwelling in booths at the autumn festival is only one of the reminiscences of the desert sojourn. The law of blood-revenge, which is the only way of securing the public peace in the desert, continued in force in Israel long after it was a settled nation.

The religion of the desert is polydæmonism. The *jinn* inhabit every rock and bush, and many of them receive worship from men. To a very late time Israel remembered that it had worshipped the hairy monsters that infest the desert.³ Totemism is one of the forms in which tribal man attempts to come into relation with superhuman powers. The vestiges of totemism which persist in the tribe names of Israel show that this people formed no exception to the rule. Circumcision is an original tribal mark, very probably originating in the desert. The earliest account we have of its introduction in Israel dates it from the life of Moses.⁴ In one of the desert encampments Yahweh meets

¹ Notice Buhl, *Soziale Verhältnisse der Hebräer*, pp. 1, 9. It is possible that the clan of Jerachmeel was the original—or at least early—occupant of the Kadesh oasis. But I am not able to follow Prof. Cheyne in discovering numerous references to this clan in our documents; see the article "Jerachmeel" in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, and also the paper entitled "From Isaiah to Ezra" in the *American Journal of Theology* (July, 1901).

² On traces of matriarchy in Israel see Gunkel, *Genesis*, p. 37; Buhl, *Soziale Verhältnisse*, p. 28.

³ Lev. 17¹. Such passages show how wide of the mark is Renan's theory of a primitive monotheism of desert-dwelling tribes (*History of the People of Israel*, I, pp. 28, 38 ff.).

⁴ The reader will remember that the account of circumcision in Genesis is given by the latest author, while the one now under discussion is a part of the oldest tradition, embodied in J.

Moses and threatens to kill him. Zippora takes a sharp stone and circumcises her infant son, and touches her husband with the blood, whereat the wrath of the God is turned away.¹ The only plausible interpretation of the curious account is that circumcision was the tribal mark which brought a man into right relations with the tribal divinity. Moses was a member of the tribe that owed allegiance to Yahweh—whether as an Israelite or as adopted by the Kenites or Midianites we are not told—but he had not received the tribal mark. Hence the anger of the God, which was appeased by the circumcision of the substitute. We feel ourselves here to be in the circle of the most primitive ideas on this subject. The story can hardly mean to account for the origin of circumcision, but probably does mean to intimate that this was the first instance of its application to infants. The institution itself, common to a number of Asiatic and African peoples, must date from a remote antiquity.

The cycle of festivals which are enjoined in the later religion of Israel is connected with agricultural life, and cannot be associated with the desert. The Passover in its primitive form is an exception. The Israelites were shepherds. The firstlings of the flock were probably sacrificed in the spring-time, as was the case among the Arabs down to a recent date.² To this extent Hebrew tradition is correct in emphasising the Passover celebration at the exodus. We may even conjecture that the sprinkling of the blood on the door-posts is a reminiscence of the time when the tent was sprinkled with blood as the opening rite of a warlike expedition.³

The Hebrew writers were unconscious of the extent to which their institutions were survivals from their nomad life. Their sense of the importance of the desert, however, is seen in their account of the Patriarchs, whom they pictured as ideals and who are in every case Bedawin. The Rechabites, who appear in later history, are witnesses to the same mode of thought. Their thought was that agriculture and settled habitations were contrary

¹ Ex. 4²⁴⁻²⁶. A good discussion of the subject is contained in Marti, *Geschichte der Israelitischen Religion* (1897), p. 43 f.

² W. R. Smith, *Religion of the Semites*, pp. 210, 387, 445 f.; Wellhausen, *Reste Arabischen Heidentums*, p. 94 f.

³ Traces of such a rite are found among the Arabs according to Marti, *Geschichte der Israelitischen Religion*, p. 40.

to the will of Yahweh. The only reason that can be assigned for this view is the fact that in the consciousness of the people Yahweh was God of the desert, and that the desert life was the life pleasing to Him. The fullest expression of this idea is the claim on the part of all our documents that at Sinai (or Kadesh) Yahweh entered into covenant with Israel. Before this He had chosen them and brought them out of Egypt; but the purpose of the choice was that the covenant might be made. In the oldest document the covenant seems to be a simple agreement that Yahweh will be the God of Israel, and that He will go before them and secure them in possession of Canaan: "My presence shall go with thee and give thee rest."¹

The covenant implies some sort of obligation on the part of Israel. Obedience to the will of God is the natural requirement when a special relation has been established between Him and a people. This is the more obvious to the desert dweller, because all obligation apart from that of blood-revenge is, in a nomad society, the result of special agreement. We are not surprised, therefore, to find each of our documents giving a divine law in connexion with the wilderness sojourn. One has the well-known Decalogue; another (or perhaps the same one) has the Book of the Covenant; a third has a Decalogue of its own; Deuteronomy repeats the first Decalogue with modifications; while the Priestly writer introduces at Sinai his whole elaborate legislation together with its portable sanctuary. The most primitive of these codes is doubtless the Decalogue of J.² It consists of ritual commands, as we should expect in a religious compact. In its earliest form it seems to have read as follows:

"Thou shalt not make a molten God.
 Thou shalt keep the feast of unleavened bread.
 Every male that opens the womb is mine.
 Six days shalt thou labour and on the seventh keep Sabbath.
 The feast of weeks thou shalt observe.

¹ Ex. 33¹⁴. The verse is ascribed to a later stratum of J, but it doubtless represents an early idea. The difficulty was to reconcile the continued residence of Yahweh at Sinai with His journeying in Israel's company. One author therefore made Him send His angel, the other His presence (countenance) in which He manifested Himself.

² Ex. 34. The account is intelligible only on the hypothesis that the commands of the latter part of the chapter are the ones written upon the two tables of stone which Moses brings with him in the opening verses.

And the feast of ingathering at the turn of the year.
 Thou shalt not offer the blood of my sacrifice with leaven.
 And my Passover offering shall not remain until morning.
 The first-fruits of thy ground shalt thou bring to the house of Yahweh thy God.
 Thou shalt not boil a kid with its mother's milk."

The comparative antiquity of this Decalogue is made evident by the parallel between it and the closing section of the Book of the Covenant.¹ That it is more primitive than the Decalogue of Ex. 20 and of Deuteronomy, must be evident. The latter shows the influence of the prophetic theology, especially in the prominence it gives to the duties of man toward man. Nevertheless the commands here given cannot all go back to the desert period. The majority of them are intelligible only in connexion with an agricultural state of society. For example, the Sabbath cannot be observed by the shepherd, for his work requires daily attention. The feast of weeks and the feast of ingathering are feasts of the cultivator. We are driven, therefore, to the conclusion that this Decalogue, valuable as it is in giving us knowledge of Israelite religion after the settlement in Canaan, cannot give us knowledge of what took place before the conquest.² If the original compact between Yahweh and Israel included a series of commands, we have no way of discovering what these were. On the other hand, we have no difficulty in supposing a covenant on the simple term of obedience to the voice of Yahweh speaking in His prophet. Moses was the living exponent of the divine will. At Marah (or Massah) he gave Israel a decree and a decision; Jethro found him giving to the people "the decisions of God and His instructions"; the original Tent of Meeting was the place where God talked with Moses; Kadesh is called *En Mishpat* because of the habitual oracle there ministered by Moses. The divine afflatus descends not only upon Moses but upon

¹ This was pointed out by Bruston, *Zeitschr. für die Alttest. Wissensch.*, XII (1892), p. 181 ff. The passage in question is Ex. 23¹²⁻¹⁹—apparently the displaced copy of J's first Decalogue.

² Whether *ten* was the number of commands in this series, or *twelve* as some suppose, cannot be definitely made out, as the passage has been repeatedly worked over. Ten is so constant a number in the tradition that the presumption is in its favour here. A somewhat different arrangement from the one given above is found in Professor Briggs's instructive comparison of the different Decalogues, *Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch*,² (1897), pp. 189-210.

the seventy elders.¹ The thought of constant divine guidance through prophets or seers would militate against the giving of any extended law. All that a primitive covenant would naturally contain is an obligation to obey the will of Yahweh as it should be revealed in His prophet. Or shall we say that the original covenant was a promise that Yahweh would lead the people to conquest on condition that they would regularly give Him the first-born males of the flock? The importance of the first-born in Hebrew tradition might justify such a theory, and it is certain that to a comparatively late date public opinion in Israel confided in the help of Yahweh because of the fact that the altars were abundantly supplied with victims.

What, then, was the primitive covenant of the wilderness? The mists of antiquity prevent our seeing distinctly, but we may reasonably suppose that the religious leader who had brought a nomad clan out of Egypt was able to impress upon them the faith that Yahweh had chosen them as His own, that He would lead them against their enemies, and that He would give them the fair land on which they had cast longing eyes. The natural expression of such a faith would be a covenant, in which the different fractions of the people would renew their brotherhood and vow allegiance to Yahweh and His prophet. That this was a coalition of tribes, not all of which had known Yahweh earlier, is very possible. It was in the territory of Midian that Moses first became acquainted with the new divinity. And in another account it is Jethro who offers the first sacrifice to Yahweh, of which Aaron and all the elders are invited to partake.² The adoption of a new divinity by Israel would thus be in a certain sense the beginning of their history, and the importance given by tradition to the Mosaic age would be justified by the facts.

The covenant with the people involves Yahweh's journeying with them. Various statements in our sources embody the varying traditions which grew up on this theory. The pillar of cloud and fire is one author's method. Another gives the promise of the angel who goes as Yahweh's representative. The Ark must originally have been a visible pledge of His presence, and the

¹ Num. 11 24-30. The passage is ascribed to E², but I see no reason why it may not represent ancient ideas.

² Budde, *Religion of Israel to the Exile*, p. 23; Giesebrecht, *Die Geschichtlichkeit des Sinai Bundes* (inconclusive).

veritable place of His dwelling. The Tent of Tryst was originally parallel to the Ark—not a dwelling-place for the Ark, but for Yahweh Himself. The Tabernacle of which we have such an elaborate description in the book of Exodus is a very late fiction, created by the theory of the Priestly author, who could not conceive the congregation of Israel existing without the central sanctuary. But this structure had as a prototype the earlier and simpler tent called the Tent of Tryst. A tent is of course the only practicable sanctuary for a nomad people. According to the account in our hands, this Tent was originally placed in the midst of the camp, but was later removed outside owing to the contamination of the people in the worship of the golden bull. The author's meaning is that Yahweh was willing to travel with His people, and so to be accessible to them by the mediation of Moses. The whole account is a reflection of later conditions and its historicity is open to grave doubts. The Ark, however, makes a much more primitive impression. If the divinity of Sinai or of Kadesh resided in a rock—which from Arabic analogies seems very probable—it would be natural for the people to secure His presence by providing a chest in which to transport the fetish.¹

The formation of such a covenant as we have assumed would not take place without friction. The elevation of a prophet to the leading place in the new nation would naturally call out the jealousy of the earlier leaders—the Sheikhs. It is possible, therefore, that the murmurings of the people against Moses, of which our narrative is full, have some historic background. The most definite instance is the rebellion of Dathan and Abiram. These two leaders of the tribe of Reuben object to Moses' making himself a prince over the people, and apparently charge him with self-interest in his administration.² Such a quarrel was certain

¹ Meinhold, *Die Lade Jahwe's*, revives the theory that the Ark was a portable throne. But, as pointed out by Budde, *Z. Alttest. Wissensch.*, XXI, p. 193, this does not account for all the facts.

² Only thus can we understand Moses' declaration that he had not taken an ass from them, Num. 16¹⁵. It should be remembered that the story of Korah and his company is a separate narrative, and belongs in the Priestly document. It has been ingeniously suggested that the quarrels here described resulted in a separation of the Israelite clans into two bodies, one of which attacked Canaan directly, while the other went around Edom to the eastern desert; cf. Steuernagel, *Einwanderung der Israelitischen Stämme* (1901)

to arise whenever an energetic prophet undertook to rouse the people to a new effort. The details of the narrative are, however, the product of the legend-building imagination.

The results with which we have to content ourselves in the Mosaic period are meagre. There may have been an Israelite clan that sojourned in Egypt. Its exodus was not improbably due to a religious leader. Under this religious leader the people entered into covenant with other desert-dwelling clans at Kadesh. The God who sanctioned the alliance and who became a party to it was Yahweh, the Storm-God of Sinai. He was henceforth the leader of His people in war, and under His encouragement they undertook the conquest of Canaan.

CHAPTER V

THE CONQUEST

ACCORDING to the Pentateuch, Israel made an attempt upon Canaan from the south and were repulsed, whereupon they made the circuit of Edom, took possession of Gilead and Bashan, and entered Canaan by the Jordan valley at Jericho. Although we hear of the repulse on the southern border, we know that Judah was in part made up from clans which always had their seat in that region. We suspect, therefore, that the circuit of Edom is a device of the narrator to unite two discordant traditions. In fact it is clear on reflection that the attack of Israel on the coveted land was made at more than one point, and that it was repeated with varying success a number of times before their footing was secure. The clans settled at Kadesh were only a minute fragment of what afterward became the people of Israel.

Palestine is so situated that it has been the scene of almost continuous conflict from the earliest times. Lying between Egypt and the great Asiatic empires it was an object of desire to both its more powerful neighbours. Almost more constant is the menace of the Bedawin on its south and east. Arabia has always produced more men than it can nourish. Perhaps in no part of the world is the population so constantly on the verge of starvation. The Bedawy is at the end of the year just where he was at the beginning of the year. Nine months of the twelve the milk of his flocks has barely sufficed to keep him alive. That such a people live in a chronic state of warfare is natural. The cultivated country on the border of which they dwell is the constant object of their desire. History shows their steady pressure toward this goal. Two streams of migration have issued from Arabia from time immemorial. One proceeds northward from the Hejaz and threatens Palestine directly. The other strikes eastward and impinges upon the kingdoms of the Euphrates valley. But as these kingdoms have usually been well organised, this second stream has worked its way northward until it meets

the great current which flows from the northeast. Baffled by this, it has bent around the north end of the desert, overflowed the oasis of Damascus, and reached Palestine by way of Bashan. There is reason to suppose that both these streams have always had a part in the peopling of Palestine.¹ Both of them are therefore represented in the people that called itself Israel. Jacob is persistently connected with Aram by the Hebrew writers: Abraham is an immigrant from the Euphrates region; while, as we have just seen, the affiliation with Esau, Midian, and the Kenite would point to an Arabian source.

The Canaanite or Amorite population that was displaced or absorbed by Israel was an earlier wave of the same flowing tide. What the earliest population of Canaan was, we have no means of knowing. Hebrew tradition gives, indeed, the outlandish names of Zamzummim, Emim, Zuzim, and others. But these are too slight a foundation for a theory. The Canaanites who were in full possession before the coming of Israel were evidently kinsfolk of their conquerors. Israel's pride led to the denial of the relationship, for the genealogies derive Canaan from Ham. But this is a late hypothesis. All the facts go to show that Phœnicians, Canaanites, and Hebrews were from the same original stock. This was once distinctly taught, it would seem, in the account of the curse of Canaan.²

In the struggle which has gone on from time immemorial for the possession of Palestine, nothing is more remarkable than the weakness of both parties, a weakness founded on their lack of cohesion. Whenever the people of the settled country have been united under an energetic ruler they have laughed to scorn the attempts of the nomads. When the nomads have laid aside their tribal jealousies they have become irresistible. But for the most part neither one thing nor the other has taken place. The inhabitants of Canaan were usually divided into petty states unable to make common cause even under the severest pressure. The desert

¹ It is not within the province of this history to discuss the general question of the origin of the Semitic peoples. The reader may consult Barton, *A Sketch of Semitic Origins* (1902) and Paton, *Early History of Syria*. These authors agree that Arabia is the region from which the Semitic peoples (so far as we know them historically) emigrated. We must bear in mind that migration of peoples was the rule rather than the exception down to very recent times.

² See the chapter, "Noah als Winzer," in Budde's *Biblische Urgeschichte*.

dwellers, in their turn, never dreamed of yielding their independence in order to unite in any movement, however important.

The unification of Israel—so far as it was accomplished at all—was accomplished under Solomon. The conquest (to retain the conventional term) had been going on for four centuries or more. For, as we now know, before the exodus took place, or at least as early as the time when the southern clans were sojourning at Kadesh, Asher was already in its later seat in northern Palestine, while two districts in the centre of the country bore the names Jacob and Joseph. Even more significant is it to find somewhere in the region a people called Israel mentioned in the Egyptian lists—lists which give the conquests of the Pharaoh usually identified with the Pharaoh of the exodus.¹

It is not without reason that the Hebrew narrative makes the attempt from the south a failure. The clans settled at Kadesh can never have been powerful, for the desert in that region could not support more than a very scanty population. The conflict with the Amalekites must also have kept down their strength. It was only after the allied tribes had effected their entrance into Canaan that Caleb began to move northward, finally coalescing with Judah. The importance which Hebrew story gives to the desert sojourn is due to the consciousness that the tribes which brought Yahweh with them made the most important contribution to the life of the people.

¹The mention of Asher in inscriptions of Seti and Rameses II (about 1400 B.C.) is affirmed by W. M. Müller, *Asien und Europa in Altägyptischen Denkmälern*, p. 236 ff. On Jacob and Joseph (in the significant forms *Jacob-el* and *Joseph-el*), compare the same work, p. 162 ff., and Meyer in the *Zeitschr. f. d. Alttest. Wissensch.*, VI, pp. 1-16. These names occur in a list of Thothmes III. The mention of Israel in an inscription of Mernephtah is in such terms as to show the people already settled in the country. Cf. Offord in the *Proceedings Soc. Bib. Arch.*, 1898, p. 55; Steindorff in the *Zeitschr. Alttest. Wissensch.*, XVI, pp. 330-333; Spiegelberg in the *Sitzungsbericht d. Berliner Akademie*, 1896, p. 193 ff.; Griffiths in the *Contemporary Review*, May, 1896. The most complete discussion of this inscription is by Wiedemann in *Le Musée*, Louvain, 1898, pp. 89-107. Wiedemann emphasises the unreliable nature of the statements made in honour of an Egyptian king. "When all allowance is made for the tendency of the scribe to exaggerate the exploits of his monarch, it still remains true that in the time of Mernephtah, in connexion with a list of Canaanite towns an Egyptian was able to say, "Israel is laid waste, its corn is annihilated." The statement, however false or exaggerated, is inconceivable unless at that date Israel were known as a settled people in Canaan.

In itself considered, the story of a march around Edom presents no improbability. The Sinaitic Bedawin of the present day extend their raids into the eastern desert beyond Damascus. Were the vigilance of the defenders of Canaan relaxed at any one point, no doubt that exposed point would attract invaders from every part of the wilderness. The unhistorical character of the account is evident, however, from that part of it which narrates the conquest of the country beyond Jordan. That two battles should put Israel into complete possession of this rugged and defensible country is incredible. Legend has here condensed a long process into a single campaign. The region in question was chronically in dispute between Israel, Moab, Ammon, and Syria—not to speak of Sihon and Og, who appear in our narrative. The fragments of verse with which the story is adorned¹ really commemorate the battles and raids of a later time, at least as late as the time of Omri. It is possible that the earliest struggle was between the Amorites and Reuben, the latter being allied with Moab and Ammon. A fragment of the earlier people was adopted in Israel by the name Gad.²

What is quite certain is that Israel was settled in the transjordanic territory before the invasion of Canaan proper. In historic times the district belonged to Reuben, who is called the first-born of Israel. The dignity thus assigned to him shows that tradition made these the first Israelite settlements. In the time of Saul we find that Jabesh Gilead was fully Israelite. The association of Jacob-Israel with Mahanaim and Penuel is an indication of the same sort, while the fact that Ishbaal, the son of Saul, found a secure refuge at Mahanaim (as did David when compelled to leave his capital) shows that Israelite blood had its claims fully recognised in these ancient settlements. Once thoroughly established in Gilead, Israel had a base of attack for the reduction of Canaan.

The El Amarna tablets, discovered and deciphered in our own time, have thrown a strong light upon the state of affairs in Canaan in the fourteenth century before Christ. We have already seen that Palestine is necessarily the bone of contention between Egypt and any strong power in Western Asia. Some time before

¹ I refer to Num. 21¹⁴ f. 27-30.

² Cf. Paton, *Early History of Syria*, p. 150. The tribe of Gad called itself by the name of its divinity, of whose worship in Syria we have many evidences, Baethgen, *Beiträge zur Semit. Religionsgeschichte*, I, pp. 76-80.

the date of the tablets, Babylon had evidently been in possession of the country, for it is Babylonian script which is used by the writers even in communicating with the Egyptian court. The actual (or rather nominal) suzerain, however, was Egypt; and the records show that at this time the power or vigilance of the recognised chief monarch was much relaxed. The Egyptian court appointed native rulers with the title of king, each having under him a single city with its dependent towns. Each of these princelings paid tribute when forced to pay it; each was lavish in protestations of fidelity to his chief, "his god, his sun"; each was lavish in excuses when he thought it safe to withhold his present; each was ready to fight for his own hand against his neighbours. In case of serious invasion each was ready to claim the protection of Egypt, but each was equally ready to join hands with the invaders if Egypt should show weakness or neglect.

Now it is interesting to discover that a somewhat serious invasion was in progress at the time when these letters were written. We read repeated, earnest, sometimes despairing appeals of the princes for Egyptian help. The enemy seems to be a Bedawin people who are called Chabiri. They come from the north, and threaten Phœnicia as well as Palestine proper. Their attack seems most pressing in Phœnicia, for we find the most urgent appeals for help sent from Gebal, Beirut, Sidon, and Tyre—from whose governors some towns or fortresses have already been taken. In this region the invaders are united under a leader named Abd-Ashera, whose followers are sometimes called his sons. It is rather curious to note that this sheikh claims himself to be subject to Egypt. In Canaan similar bands are threatening Jerusalem, Makkedah, Hazor, and Gezer. On the other hand, places in Philistia such as Ashkelon have not yet been molested.

Interesting points brought out by the letters are: the comparative feebleness of the separate bands of invaders, and the readiness of the native chiefs to enter into alliance with them. The feebleness is brought out by the requests for help which in all cases assume that only a very few Egyptian soldiers will be necessary. The writers even in their greatest stress seem to think that fifty, forty, even twenty Egyptian soldiers will be able to defend their towns against the enemy. No doubt we here discover a constant feature of the long struggle with the Bedawin. The invaders have no means of compelling walled

towns.¹ Siege-works and battering-rams are wholly beyond them. If only the walls are sound and provisions do not give out, the citizens may scoff at the invaders. For the most part the attempt to reduce a fortress by starvation will fail, for the besiegers themselves have no regular commissariat. If they bring their flocks with them they soon graze off the immediate neighbourhood and are compelled to move on.

These considerations show how the process may extend over a long period of time. Occasionally, no doubt, a large company of invaders may carry a place by sudden assault. The religious frenzy which drives them to such a deed is likely to lead to the extermination of the unfortunate victims. By a solemn vow the town and its inhabitants are in such a case devoted to the divinity whom the assaulting party regards as its leader. The story of Jericho shows the thoroughness with which one such vow was carried out. Mesha of Moab boasts of the Israelite towns which he had thus "devoted" to Chemosh.

But, for the most part, such extreme measures are not reached. The townspeople recognise that it is better to make peace with their tormentors. By the payment of blackmail they can make allies of their enemies, and perhaps even employ them against their neighbours with whom they are at feud. In the desert it is not uncommon for the cultivators of the oases to pay tribute to the Bedawin in order to secure themselves peace. Mohammed's terms at Kheibar are only a specimen of what has taken place again and again. So the men of Jabesh were willing to enter into any reasonable arrangement with the Ammonites. It was only the harshness and humiliation of the terms actually offered which prevented an understanding in this case. When an understanding is once reached, the parties are on amicable terms enough. The Bedawin agree to respect the rights of the townsmen, and honourably carry out the agreement. Alliances are made between individuals on both sides; the Arab has a friend in town whom he visits, the townsman has some one to whom he can appeal in case the flocks trespass on the cultivated ground. Inter-marriage follows, and the final amalgamation of the two stocks. The Patriarchal sagas already considered give evidence that many such

¹ The inability of Mohammed's enemies to carry the very feeble entrenchments at Medina, in the Campaign of the Ditch, is a striking illustration of a similar condition of things.

alliances were entered into by Israel. For instance, Abraham and Isaac both make covenants with Abimelech. Judah has a friend Hirah the Adullamite, who is of the earlier inhabitants, and he takes Tamar, a Canaanitess, as wife for his son. The allies of Abraham in the very late account of his attack upon Chedorlaomer are Canaanites. Jacob's purchase of ground, and Abraham's purchase of a burial-place, are examples of titles secured by peaceful means. The early documents know that the conquest was an extended process. Thus we have a promise of Yahweh given by the mouth of Moses to the effect that He would not drive the enemy out suddenly, but little by little.¹

The El Amarna tablets reveal a somewhat extended invasion going on. Whether it be the Hebrew immigration is not yet certainly made out. The *Chabiri* of the tablets cannot be affirmed to be the Hebrews. But Chabiri and Hebrews are a part of the same general stream of migration. We see alliances already forming between the towns and the invaders. The Old Testament testifies that Israel established itself by means of such alliances. Later writers make this, indeed, the basis of a serious charge against Israel.²

¹ Exod. 23²⁸⁻³⁰.

² The cuneiform tablets discovered at El Amarna in Egypt are published in transliterated text with translation by Winckler (*Keilinschr. Bibliothek*, V, Berlin, 1896). Up to the time of their discovery it was not known that Egypt had any rights in Canaan at the time of the conquest—the Hebrew sources nowhere show any knowledge of this fact. The unsettled state of the country at the writing of the tablets is indicated by the complaint of Burnaburiash, king of Babylon, that his caravans have been plundered on their way to Egypt (Winckler, p. 27). It is not only the Chabiri who are dangerous to the towns, we hear also of the Amorites and Hittites as hostile to the Egyptian supremacy. The Chabiri who follow Abd Ashera are sometimes described as coming from Mitanni and Kash, which were Mesopotamian countries (pp. 185, 189). They were in alliance with the Hittites, or were perhaps mercenaries in their service, for they seem also to have enlisted as mercenaries under the Canaanitish rulers (Letter 144, p. 265). That they were ready to enter into alliance with the natives is illustrated by the petition of the people of Gebal to their governor that he "make alliance with the Sons of Abd Ashera, that we may have peace" (p. 203), and in the complaint that the people are falling away to the Chabiri (p. 299). Various points of interest in the tablets are brought out by Petrie, *Syria and Egypt from the Tell El Amarna Letters* (N. Y., 1898); Trampe, *Syrien vor dem Eindringen der Israeliten* (Berlin, 1898); Klostermann, *Ein Diplomatischer Briefwechsel aus dem zweiten Jahrtausend vor Christi* (Kiel, 1898); Niebuhr, *Die Amarna Zeit* (Leipzig, 1899); Iastrow, in the *Journal of Bibl. Lit.*, XI.

As we might expect, the literary imagination compressed the long process of conquest into a short, sharp conflict. The book of Joshua was the result. In this narrative, Israel, after encamping some time in the Plains of Moab, crosses the Jordan and establishes itself at Gilgal. Here the reproach of Egypt is rolled away by the circumcision of the people. Spies are sent out who discover that the people of the land are already in a panic. Jericho falls by a miracle, and is made an example by utter "devotion." Even the ground on which the ruins lie is put under a curse. A reverse at Ai is the means of discovering Achan's sacrilege. After his detection and punishment the town falls, being devoted like Jericho. Its destruction is followed by the building of an altar on Ebal. Then comes the treaty with the Gibeonites, secured by deceit on their part, and conceded by criminal carelessness on the part of Joshua. The treaty is resented by the Canaanites, who attack the new allies of Israel. This gives Joshua new occasion for battle, and the natives are routed at Beth-horon—a battle marked by direct divine interposition in response to Joshua's prayer. The capture of the cities in the region is an easy matter, and the inhabitants are without exception devoted at the edge of the sword.

This experience is duplicated for the northern part of the country. Jabin, king of Hazor, gathers an immense army at the Waters of Merom. Joshua destroys the army, hamstringing the horses, and burns the chariots. After this, he takes possession of the cities, exterminating the inhabitants, but taking the property for Israel. There follows a list of the kings that have been overthrown. The whole land is left entirely free for Israel to partition and occupy. The description and assignment of the territory occupy the latter part of the book.¹

p. 95 ff., XII, p. 61 ff. Paton, *Early History of Syria*, p. 111 ff.; Winckler, *Keilschriften und Altes Testament*,³ p. 196 ff.

The reader may perhaps object to the El Amarna letters being called to testify to the condition of Palestine, both in the Patriarchal period and at the time of the conquest. Strictly speaking, they testify to the state of things a little before the Israelite invasion. But they imply that a similar condition had existed during some centuries before the time of their composition.

¹ The Book of Joshua falls naturally into two parts; first an account of the battles with the Canaanites, then a sketch of the division of the country among the tribes. The latter (chapters 13–24) is simply a reflection of geographical divisions as they existed at a later time. This section, at any

It is only an *a priori* objection to this account to say that no nation ever dealt with a conquered country in this wholesale manner, or that the complete extermination of a whole people is an impossibility. The defender of the narrative might plead that in this case the impossible took place, and that Israel's exigency required measures elsewhere unparalleled in history. What leads us to doubt the historicity of the narrative is the fact (already noted) that the Old Testament sources themselves give abundant indications of another sort of conquest. It is, for example, a frequent complaint of the Old Testament writers that Israel did not exterminate the earlier inhabitants of Canaan. On the one side, this is attributed to the incorrigible lust of Israel for alliance and intermarriage with the heathen; on the other side, it is accounted for by the purpose of Yahweh Himself. Either He left the people of the land to be gradually dispossessed, in order that the wild animals might not increase and become unconquerable; or He left them in order that Israel might be kept in martial exercise; or else He kept them to test Israel's fidelity to himself in full view of the religions of Canaan; or finally, He kept them alive as scourges with which to punish His people's disobedience.¹ The variety of explanations emphasises the fact that the Canaanites, so far from being destroyed by Joshua, were a prominent part of society at least down to the time of Deuteronomy.

Equally significant is the testimony of other documents to the fact that the cities said to have been destroyed by Joshua were not actually in the possession of Israel until a much later time. The most conspicuous example is Jerusalem, which did not become Israelite until the time of David. Even the narrative we have been considering ascribes the conquest of Hebron not to Joshua, but to Caleb.² Debir fell before the prowess of Othniel;

rate, can make no claim to be history, because it comes from a postexilic author, whose distance from the events would prevent his having any accurate knowledge of what took place. The composite nature of the rest of the book is evident. Its oldest sections are found repeated in other connexions, where they give a very different impression from the one made by the book of Joshua. Their true import will be seen below.

¹ Compare Judges, 2²⁰⁻²², 3², with Deut. 7²².

² According to Joshua, 15¹⁴, Caleb drove out the Anakim from Hebron, though Hebron had been captured and its inhabitants had been massacred by Joshua, 10³⁶ f.

Gezer was Canaanite until the time of Solomon. Beth-shan was Canaanite in the time of Saul. Jabin, king of Hazor, was not a contemporary of Joshua, but of a much later generation. Shechem in the very centre of Israelite territory remained Canaanite through the period of the Judges.¹

Now the account of the battle of Merom suggests the nature of the literary process. We compare the victory of Joshua there with the victory of Deborah and Barak in the Great Plain, and we see striking points of resemblance. In both cases the leader of the enemy is Jabin, king of Hazor; in both cases the Canaanites have a large force of chariots; in both, the victory of Israel is complete. The Waters of Merom² at which Joshua meets the enemy are not yet identified, but the Great Plain in which Barak defeats Sisera is for a chariot force the most appropriate ground in the region. The conclusion is obvious—the account of Joshua's battle is a later reflection of the victory of Barak.

And if one of Joshua's great battles is the reflection of an event that took place later, the other is probably like it. In the life of Saul we find a conspicuous event in the defeat of the Philistines. This battle begins at Michmash, but during the day the enemy are driven westward beyond Beth-horon.³ But Beth-horon is the scene of Joshua's great victory. It is easy to suppose that tradition has here duplicated a single event, in which case the exploit of Saul is the original.

The account of the conquest given by the Book of Joshua fails us, therefore, when we seek for facts. And the reason why it fails us is found in the nature of the book. The aim of the author is not history, but edification. Writing at a comparatively late date, and looking back upon a remote past, he sees the conquest as a signal act of Yahweh's kindness to His people. To glorify this kindness is, in the author's mind, much more important than

¹ On Gezer, cf. 1 Kings, 9¹⁶; Beth-shan, 1 Sam. 31¹⁰; Jabin is a Canaanitish king in the time of Deborah, Judges, 4²; Shechem seems to be Canaanite under Abimelech, Judges 9.

² The current identification of this site with the Huleh lake is without any support in the Biblical text.

³ 1 Sam. 14³⁰; it does not seem violent to conclude this on the basis of Jonathan's assertion that if the people had been a little more vigorous, they would have driven the enemy to Aijalon, which lay some distance below Beth-horon.

to ascertain what actually took place. Hence the superhuman character of the events. The Ark only needs to approach the Jordan in order that its waters may flee. The stones of Gilgal are chosen and set up by divine command as memorial stones. Jericho falls without human effort, but not without giving us an edifying example of treachery in the person of Rahab. The transgression of Achan, its disastrous results, the detection and punishment, are narrated at length in order to emphasise the taboo laid upon the Canaanites. The sparing of the Gibeonites was a historical fact too obstinate to be ignored. The only way to account for it was to suppose the covenant obtained by deceit. Even then the author cannot wait for Solomon to reduce the unfortunate people to slavery, but attributes this step to Joshua. In short, the book is an imaginative picture of what might have taken place, had the conquest occupied a few weeks instead of two centuries or more.¹

In this state of affairs it is especially fortunate that another account of the conquest has been preserved to us. This is the narrative which we now read in the opening chapter of the Book of Judges. Editorially it has been adapted to its present position by a superscription which dates the events after the death of Joshua. The incongruity of this with the narrative which precedes, is evident. If the Canaanites had been exterminated by Joshua, there would have been no need to begin the conquest over again. Leaving out this false date, we see that this author is giving an account of the conquest as it actually took place. He knows nothing of a leader named Joshua—knows nothing of an Israel united under a single general. In fact, he goes back to the sojourn of Israel in Kadesh, and shows us their attack upon the country from the south. Judah and Simeon, we learn, took possession of Bezek, Hebron, Debir, and Hormah. Three of these we know to have been in the southern district, and the capture of Hormah is in another passage expressly said to have

¹ The Book of Joshua is a part of the Hexateuch and is made up from the elements which appear in the other five books. But it has very few traces of the earliest document (J) whose account of the conquest did not agree with the later theory and was therefore left out. Fortunately it was not wholly lost, as we shall see. The account in Joshua shows strong Deuteronomistic colouring. An author who thought the forefathers must have fulfilled the later ideal by the complete destruction of the Canaanites, worked over the account of E with the results now in our hand.

been effected from the desert.¹ The mention of the Kenites and the Amalekites in the original text of our passage, argues in the same direction. Moreover, had Judah invaded the country from the Jordan valley, its march would have been opposed by the powerful fortress of Jerusalem which confessedly was Canaanite till the time of David.

In this passage we learn that Simeon was in near alliance with Judah. We hear also of Caleb as leader in the attack on Hebron and Othniel as the conqueror of Debir. In both cases we have reason to suspect that the names really represent clans which were afterward accounted subdivisions of Judah. The story of Achsah and her request to Caleb is an ætiological saga, designed to establish an ancient claim to certain springs of water. This shows that even here we are not on thoroughly historical ground. But the account has a very much better conception of what actually took place than we find in the Book of Joshua. Besides the exploits of Judah the only warlike event it narrates is the capture of Bethel by the tribe of Joseph, and this is accomplished by the commonplace method of treachery and surprise. For the rest the author contents himself with enumerating the towns which the Israelites were not able to conquer, but in which they obtained rights as clients. This illustrates what was said above about the method of coalition. When the newcomers became troublesome they obtained admission to certain territories by treaty. The treaty allowed them to build quarters of their own in the cities. At first they were not recognised as on an equality with the older citizens, but had the inferior rights of "sojourners." Thus the two peoples dwelt side by side in many of the cities, certainly as late as the time of Solomon, and it is this state of affairs² which the author has before his eyes. When the Israelites became strong enough, they reversed the relations, reducing the Canaanites to clientage, to forced labour, or even to slavery. Extermination, which was the ideal of later times, was not thought of while the problem was a practical one.

¹ Num. 21¹⁻³, which originally followed directly on the account of the spies. It is natural to connect the city of palms of Judg. 1¹⁶ with the Tamar which we know to have existed in the South Country. The subject is discussed by Steuernagel, *Einwanderung der Israelitischen Stämme* (1901).

² The Arab analogies are striking. Compare, for example, the state of things at Medina when Mohammed came thither; Wellhausen, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, IV (1889).

The harmony of this representation (barring a little foreshortening) with what we have found in the El Amarna tablets is evidence of its truth. In the tablets we see a strong wave of immigration making itself felt in the country. In the Hebrew account we see how it has distributed itself, making its way to all parts of the land. The details of its entrance into the different settlements escape our knowledge. We have already seen that the episode of Dinah in Genesis represents one way. In the book of Judges we have another characteristic incident in the campaign of the Danites. Here we find the tribe of Dan already settled in the country, but straitened by attack on both sides. They therefore send out spies to seek new seats. Any town open to attack is regarded as fair game. The report of the spies shows that Laish, at the foot of Mount Hermon, is a town detached from its natural allies, the Sidonians, and at the same time unsuspecting of attack. The whole fighting force of the tribe—six hundred men is the number—marches forth against the city. They take it unawares, storm the walls, put the inhabitants to the sword, and divide the land among themselves.¹

The account, as well as the action of the Danites, betrays no conscience concerning the transaction. It is assumed that a state of war exists everywhere except where it is barred by kinship or by express treaty rights. The Canaanites must look out for themselves, and if they are caught unprotected they have only themselves to blame. These are the principles held by both parties during the long period of Israelite invasion. Probably many a town which confided in its walls fell a victim to its own sense of security and the aggressive alertness of the invaders. Many, however, rather than be subject to unexpected attack chose the part of discretion, and made some sort of arrangement with the enemy. For the most part a treaty made with religious sanctions was sufficient to secure a tolerable peace, though the instance of Saul and the Gibeonites shows that this was not always the case. From the later point of view the state of society was unsettled as compared with the king's peace—"there was no king in Israel, and every man did that which was right in his own eyes."

¹ Judges, 18. The present account is composite, but the older portion can be separated out with some certainty; cf. Moore's edition in *Haupt's Sacred Books of the Old Testament*.

When this oldest account of the conquest¹ is carefully examined we find that after some centuries of struggle Israel was in full possession of the highlands of Judah and the highlands of Ephraim only. In the valleys the Canaanites were able to maintain themselves "because they had chariots of iron." North of the Great Plain the process of mingling had gone furthest, and we infer from certain indications that the Israelites there were in subjection to the older inhabitants. The Testament of Jacob² compares Issachar to a pack-animal, willing to serve so long as it is fed. And the Song of Deborah intimates that the northern tribes were restrained by their Canaanite alliances from taking part with their brethren against the common enemy. All this time, however, amalgamation was going on, and when a strong Israelite leader came to the front many Canaanitish elements had already become absorbed in Israel.

¹ Judges, 1. That this chapter contains J's account of the conquest was pointed out by E. Meyer in the *Zeitschr. f. d. Alttest. Wissensch.*, I, pp. 117-145. His results have been accepted by all recent commentators, including Nowack (*Handkommentar*, 1900).

² Gen. 49. The ancient poem is a description rather than a Testament or Blessing.

CHAPTER VI

THE HEROES

FOLLOWING the account of the conquest and division of the land under Joshua we have in our Hebrew Canon a book which we call traditionally *Judges*. In the form in which we now read it, it is a work of edification like the others we have considered. This form, however, is reached by a redactional process, and we are able to distinguish between the material which the editor found ready to hand, and the additions which he made. The substance of the book is a series of stories about Israel's deliverers. They are fitted into a framework which makes them teach the uniform lesson that backsliding from Yahweh is followed by punishment, in the form of war and defeat, while repentance is rewarded by deliverance and victory. The stories often show their reluctance to teach this lesson by the very imperfect manner in which they meet the views of the compiler. In themselves they are of the utmost value as illustrating the early age of Israel's conflicts.¹

In this book we find the Israelites settled in the midst of the Canaanites, and in a chronic state of warfare. The central highlands (Ephraim) are in their possession, but they may be called at any time to defend themselves either against the older inhabitants or against fresh invaders from the desert. It is evident that the stream of migration is still pushing on from the East. The next wave is as willing to overwhelm Israel as Israel has been willing to submerge the Canaanites. The strongholds in the plains are still

¹The structure of the Book of Judges has been carefully investigated by recent scholars, including Budde (*Richter und Samuel*, 1890; *Das Buch der Richter*, 1897), Moore (*International Critical Commentary*, 1895; *The Book of Judges* in Haupt's *Sacred Books of the Old Testament*, 1898; critical edition of the Hebrew text in Haupt's series, 1900), and Nowack (*Richter-Ruth* in the *Handkommentar*, 1900). The stories which form the groundwork of the book are sometimes composite, and there seems to have been a double redaction. The artificial scheme of the final editor made the number of "Judges" twelve. This was secured by inserting the minor Judges, of which the names only are known.

in possession of the ancient inhabitants. Between the two hostile forces Israel is in danger of being ground to pieces.

The danger of the situation is increased by the lack of unity in Israel itself. The tribes have evidently fought for their own hand. The vague sense of kindred which undoubtedly exists is not sufficient to keep them from attacking each other. It may even be doubted whether Judah was yet counted a part of Israel. In any case, the tribes are not able to make common cause even against a powerful enemy. The social organisation is still that of the desert. There is no central authority, no authority at all, properly speaking, even for a single tribe. The Sheikhs have a certain influence due to the purity of their blood, but the influence is never sufficient to coerce the freemen of the tribe. A man of extraordinary energy, or one who shows especial prowess in war, is doubtless respected in the community. The expression of his wishes will receive some attention because his fellow-tribesmen desire to stand well with him, or because they fear his displeasure. He may declare war or rather plan a campaign, but his following from the fighting men will be volunteers moved by personal affection for him or by confidence in his ability to lead them where they will get revenge, or booty, or both. He cannot issue an order or levy contributions.

In ordinary times such a man is only the older brother of the poorest tribesman. But if he be a man of upright purpose he is likely to increase his prestige by arbitrating the differences between his brethren. Where such differences arise the man who is wronged, or who thinks himself wronged, looks about for an ally who will help him to his own. The cry of the suitor is not "hear and decide my case" but "avenge me of mine adversary." The Sheikh thus becomes the vindicator of the oppressed, and it is in this way that we must interpret his title. The Judges whose exploits are related for us in the period now under review were in no sense magistrates. They were men who had vindicated the rights of Israel in battle. Later times, misled by the double meaning of the word *judge*, gave them something of the kingly position and prerogatives. In truth the time in which they lived was a time when every man did what was right in his own eyes. There was neither law nor tribunal in our sense of the word.¹

¹ The *Suffetes* of Carthage are evidently the *Shophetim* of the Hebrews, showing that a regular magistracy may develop from the extraordinary insti-

The position of Barak, Gideon, and Jephthah in the community is thus quite clear. They were raised up to vindicate the rights of their people against the oppressor. Another thing is not quite so clear. As has been shown above, tribal society is based upon the custom of blood revenge. When a man is killed it is the duty of all the clan to avenge his death. But this does not mean that the murderer is to be executed. If he can be taken, well and good ; but the blood he has shed rests upon his whole clan. Justice is satisfied if any member of the clan is slain as an equivalent for the murdered man. Of course there must be equality—freeman for freeman, client for client, slave for slave. What we do not always make clear to ourselves is that this gives legitimacy to private warfare in the form which we call assassination. That the brother of a murdered man should make his way in disguise into the camp of the murderer and there strike down the first man he meets (though innocent of any part in the crime that is to be avenged) strikes us with horror. It is not so in tribal society. The public conscience does not condemn assassination where there is blood between the parties—it rather applauds it.¹ The public enemy, of course, stands upon the same footing with the private enemy, for blood revenge must be taken for men slain in battle as well as for those slain in private quarrel. While our own code therefore condemns Ehud as an assassin, we can understand how the conscience of his kinsmen hailed him as their deliverer.

The first story of deliverance gives us almost nothing but the bare scheme of the editor. It relates that Israel forgot Yahweh and served the Baals and Asherahs. Yahweh was incensed against them and sold them into the power of Chushan-rishathaim, king of Syria, on the Euphrates. From this oppression they were delivered by Othniel ben Kenaz, Caleb's younger brother. As we have evidence that Caleb is only the eponym of a clan, the flesh and blood character of Othniel is open to doubt. Chushan-rishathaim has a name that does not inspire confidence, and an invasion from Syria is out of line with all the

tution here described for us. But among the Hebrews the development was arrested by the monarchy.

¹ Mohammed's unscrupulousness in this matter is well known. What is to us so revolting does not seem to have offended his contemporaries, whether friends or foes.

other feuds of which we read in the period. It has been acutely conjectured that for Syria (Aram) we should read Edom, and that we have here a trace of the early struggles between Judah and Edom, of which there must have been many.¹ Even if this be true the absence of detail in the narrative makes it valueless for our purpose, and we must go on to Ehud, the first real deliverer.

The familiar story² is to the effect that Moab invaded Israel and made them tributary. The only tribe affected seems to have been Benjamin. Eglon, the Moabite king, established himself in Jericho, and hither the Benjamites brought their tribute, which was of course paid in kind. One of the sheikhs responsible for the payment was Ehud, a man left-handed. In his defect he found his opportunity. In preparing for his deed, he concealed a long dagger on his right side—where the king's guard, if they searched him, would not think to look. Thus armed, he headed the long train of bearers. The tribute being delivered, the train retreated as far as the images at Gilgal—a well-known sanctuary. Here Ehud dismissed them and made his way alone to the palace. On the pretext of discovering secret information he was admitted to a private audience in the upper chamber of the palace. The declaration, "I have a message of God for thee, O King," caused the king to rise from his seat—the respect which the oriental feels for a man inspired sufficiently accounts for the movement. A single stab in the abdomen accomplished the purpose of the Benjamite. The security of the attendants was such that Ehud made his escape before their suspicions were awakened. Benjamin was aroused; the Moabite garrison was cut off. The result was deliverance from the oppressor.³

The next event recounted for us is of far-reaching importance, because it is the first case in which Israel overcame a regular

¹ The words Aram and Edom are very similar in Hebrew and there are some cases of their confusion by the scribes in our Hebrew Bibles. The substitution of Edom for Aram in this passage (Judges 3⁷⁻¹¹) was made by Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, I, p. 412 f., and has recently been taken up by Winckler, *Geschichte Israels*, II, p. 118. Further conjectures are recorded by Paton, *Early History of Syria*, p. 161 f.

² Judges 3¹²⁻³⁰.

³ The apparent smoothness of the narrative should not blind us to the difficulty of forming a clear conception of what actually happened. How Ehud obtained the private audience will probably always remain obscure. I think it probable that in the original narrative he was entertained by the king as his guest.

army in the plain. As was to be expected, so great an event was worthily celebrated in the songs of the people, and one of the most important literary monuments of the Old Testament is the Song of Deborah which is connected by tradition with this victory. In attempting to discover what took place the Song is our chief reliance. The prose narrative is later and less original.¹ The course of events seems to be somewhat as follows:

Israel was firmly settled in the central highlands in the district known as Mount Ephraim. Between them and Judah, however, was a strip of Canaanite territory dominated by the important fortress of Jerusalem, as yet unconquered. West of Jerusalem we know that at least Kirjath jearim was a member of the Gibeonite confederacy. On this side, therefore, Ephraim and Benjamin were cut off from their natural allies. There was, however, no active hostility on this side—perhaps the Gibeonite treaty was already in force. The scene of war was to the north, where the Great Plain (Esdraelon) was entirely in the hand of the Canaanites. Taanach and Megiddo in the edge of the Plain are known to have been Canaanite strongholds. Such also was Beth-shan at the opening of the side valley of Jezreel into the Jordan valley. Issachar may have held the ridge of Gilboa, while Zebulun and Naphtali had wedged themselves among the earlier inhabitants on the hills to the north of the Great Plain. But the first impulse which had brought them into the country had spent itself. Under the lead of an energetic prince named Sisera, the Canaanites had pulled themselves together, and the Israelites were crowded to the wall. Some of them were reduced to serfdom. The caravan roads were insecure, being at the mercy of the tyrant's soldiers. Traffic almost ceased, the cultivated country was plundered, the fighting men were disarmed, so that no spear or shield was seen among the forty thousand of Israel.²

Sisera's capital seems to have been to the north of the Great Plain and not far distant from it. Here he mustered his army

¹ It is now generally recognised that the prose narrative (Judg. 4) is later than the poem which follows. The former is, moreover, composite, mingling the account of a war with Jabin with that of the war with Sisera.

² The oppression is said to have taken place in the days of Shamgar ben Anath (Judges 5⁶). This Shamgar has been conjectured to be the father of Sisera, and the non-Semitic character of the name indicates a foreign, perhaps a Hittite, invasion; so Moore, *Journal of the Am. Oriental Soc.* XIX, II (1898), p. 159 f.

for a great raid which was designed to break the remaining power of Israel. His force of chariots was so considerable that resistance seemed to be vain. But Yahweh is not always on the side of the heaviest artillery. The leading spirit in Israel was a woman named Deborah, who is described as a prophetess. In this case, as in so many others, a religious leader alone could infuse faith and courage into the people. The prose narrative makes her judge Israel—doubtless by oracular revelation of the divine will. We saw in the case of Moses that a prophet naturally became the arbiter of disputes among the people. The oldest law book expressly provides that certain cases shall be brought to God for decision. Deborah, seated under one of the sacred trees, of which the country was full, gave responses to those who came to inquire concerning the will of God. Doubtless many such inspired women attained to public reputation during the history of Israel. But not many of them used their influence to rouse patriotic enthusiasm in a time of danger.

All that we know is that this woman gave a message of God to Barak, the Sheikh of Naphtali, commanding him to bring what forces he could muster to Mount Tabor. Probably her influence was exerted on the chiefs of the other tribes at the same time, urging them to make common cause against the common enemy. The locality was favourable for a rally of the tribes. On the wooded slopes the warriors would be out of the reach of the dreaded chariots; at the same time they would be within striking distance should the enemy expose himself on the march. According to tradition ten thousand out of Israel's forty thousand able-bodied men responded to the summons. In ordinary circumstances, ill armed as they were, they could not cope with the force under Sisera's command. The chariots were superior so long as they had ground on which to manœuvre.

But the circumstances soon became extraordinary. Under a heavy rainfall the alluvial plain becomes a morass, in which heavy troops find it impossible to move.¹ The hopes of Israel in the God of battle and of the storm were not disappointed. Yahweh came from Sinai; the mountains shook, the earth trembled, the clouds poured down water; the stars from their courses fought against Sisera. A cloud-burst inundated the plain and made it a sea of mire. The chariots sank in the bog, and the

¹ So the Turkish cavalry found to their cost some millenniums later.

frantic efforts of horses and drivers produced a panic which soon became a rout. The insignificant stream of Kishon became a river choked with chariots, horses, and the dead bodies of the Canaanites. The light-armed Israelites, as we may suppose, hung on the skirts of the disheartened and flying foe. If only the people of Meroz—an Israelite village that commanded the road of the fugitives—had been true to their opportunity the whole force of the enemy might have been annihilated.

As it was, the victory was a signal one, and it was made more complete by the death of the hated Sisera. He indeed did not perish in the *mêlée*. Abandoning his chariot he succeeded in making his way on foot some distance toward his capital. Wearied and footsore he stopped at a Bedawin encampment and asked for refreshment. The tent-dwellers were Kenites, ancient friends of Israel who had come with them into the Promised Land, but who had not adopted the agricultural life. Gipsy-like they still kept up the nomad life, camping wherever they could find pasture. Jael, the wife of the Sheikh, was the only one at home. Though her people were not involved in the struggle, their sympathies were with Israel. When the fugitive king appeared, she poured him out a bountiful bowl of sour milk, the favourite beverage of the Bedawy. But before he had swallowed a mouthful she struck him with the mallet—the familiar tool used by the nomad to drive his tent-pins. The blow crushed his temple and he fell dead at her feet.

Technically, the unfortunate man was not yet protected by the law of hospitality, since he had not yet drunk of the offered beverage. The reader will recall that Sir Walter Scott makes Saladin careful to strike down the Master of the Templars before he has partaken of the cup proffered the guest. So far as the poem is taken as authority, Jael cannot be charged with treachery. The author of the prose narrative has brought gratuitous reproach upon her by expanding the account.¹

It is not difficult in reading this ancient song to discover Israel in the making. There is as yet no nation, only a loose agglomeration of clans. They are not yet the twelve tribes of

¹ He makes Jael go out to meet Sisera and invite him to the tent. She brings him milk, which he drinks and is thereby fully assured of safety. She then steals upon him when asleep and drives the tent-pin through his head. The poem knows nothing of all this.

later tradition. Machir and Gilead are in the same class with Zebulun and Reuben. When the scheme of twelve tribes took shape, Machir became simply a subdivision of Manasseh. While the poet is conscious that all the tribes he names are of the same blood, he shows by his taunts how little the tribes themselves recognised the claims of kinship. The sons of Reuben debated the matter of joining their brethren. But remote from the scene of the war, they came to no decision—which was equivalent to an adverse decision. Gilead, the other transjordanic tribe, shared the inaction of Reuben. Dan and Asher, on the other hand, were compromised with the Canaanites, for both of them had an interest in the maritime trade: “Dan goes abroad in ships, and Asher tarries on the shore, sitting still at the landing-places.”

One of the most remarkable things about the ode is its silence concerning Judah, Simeon, and Levi. The Testament of Jacob contains a hint that Simeon and Levi had been overtaken by some disaster, brought upon them by their own recklessness, and the story of Dinah indicates that they had been foremost in hostility to the Canaanites. We can only conclude that they had been practically wiped out not long before the date of our story. Silence with reference to Judah, however, must be interpreted in the light of what was said above. Mere remoteness from the scene of conflict was scarcely enough to excuse his absence. Nor does the fact that Canaanite territory intervened between him and his brothers justify inaction. The only hypothesis which fits the case is that Judah was not of full Israelitish blood. The tribe was made up partly of Edomite clans, partly of Canaanitish elements, as we see from the story of Tamar. It was now in the making, and had not coherence enough to be counted a tribe. The Joseph clans were not yet ready to recognise the kinship; in fact, the secret of later disunion is here laid bare.

At this time the poet estimates Israel's fighting men to be forty thousand in number. The modesty of this estimate compared with the extravagance of many numerical data in the Hebrew historical books makes a favourable impression.

The strong religious spirit which animates the poem shows the exaltation at the time of oppression and conflict. Yahweh is a God of war. Though His home is in the southern desert, He sees the oppression of His people and marches to their relief. He

shows Himself in the storm, and under His leadership heavenly powers attack the foe. The enemies of Israel are Yahweh's enemies. The curse is pronounced upon Meroz because its people did not take the side of Yahweh. The destruction of Sisera is an omen for the future, when the enemies of Yahweh and of Israel shall all likewise perish.

The signal deliverance wrought under Deborah's lead made less impression upon succeeding generations than was made by the incident which comes next in the narrative. So we may judge from the complicated literary process which has left its marks upon the story of Gideon. Scarcely anywhere are the duplications of the present text so perplexing, and nowhere is it more necessary to get at the earliest form of the narrative in order to make it of historical use.¹

The scene is laid in Mount Ephraim, where Gideon was Sheikh of a clan called Abiezer, with his home at Ophrah. The town has not been certainly identified, but was not far from Shechem, and was near the edge of the Jordan Valley.² At the time of the story Israel, now thoroughly agricultural, is distressed by Bedawin invaders who are called Midianites. They and their cattle, after their wont, destroyed the face of the country like the proverbial swarm of locusts. The hero of the story having rescued a few stalks of wheat, was obliged to beat them out in the wine-press under the cover afforded by the vineyard. Meditating upon the distress of Israel, he heard a divine voice encouraging him to take the part of deliverer. An altar erected on the spot commemorated the theophany for many years after.

¹ The marks of a double narrative and of more than one redaction are brought out by Prof. Moore's editions in colours and by Nowack's translation, printed in different kinds of type. The two names of the hero (Jerubbaal and Gideon) clearly show a double source. The double account of his call is easily distinguished. In one document (Judg. 6¹¹⁻²⁴) the Angel of Yahweh appears to him, giving unmistakable proofs of his identity. In the other, Gideon receives the divine message in a dream of the night, and tests its origin by the fleece which is alternately left dry or soaked by the night mist according to his prayer (6³⁶⁻⁴⁰). A later addition is the attempt to account for the name Jerubbaal. Originally expressing the faith that *The Lord-Fights* for Israel, it was no longer understood, and was made to mean *He-fights-against-Baal*.

² That it was also near the Great Plain is not so certain, as the data which are usually interpreted in favour of such a location occur in later portions of the narrative, or are themselves uncertain.

The distress of Israel was not, however, the moving cause in Gideon's exploit. The invasion had come nearer to him personally, in that the enemy had murdered many of his immediate family. Moved by personal grief and the sacred duty of blood-revenge, he was possessed by the spirit of Yahweh, and called the clan to war. Three hundred of the clansmen responded. A sudden night-attack threw the undisciplined host of Midian into confusion, and they fled toward the desert beyond Jordan. Gideon and his men followed them to the wilderness and inflicted a second defeat upon them, bringing the chiefs back to Ophrah. Here, when questioned as to the murders, the prisoners boasted of their deed, and were put to death by Gideon's own hand.¹ It is interesting to see the veteran warrior encourage his youthful son to flesh his sword upon these enemies of the clan.

The lack of unity in Israel is brought out in this narrative by the behaviour of Succoth and Penuel. These were two ancient Israelitish towns, yet both of them refused aid and comfort to Gideon's exhausted men. He, on his part, did not hesitate to take the offensive against them for their unbrotherly conduct. According to another document, Ephraim took offence at not having been invited to the war—Gideon, it should be noted, belonged to Manasseh. A soft answer from him turned away their wrath, but the incident shows the lack of common interest in the tribes.

The piety of Gideon is shown by his consecration of the spoils of war. The amulets taken from the enemy were made into an ephod, by which we must understand an image of Yahweh. The offence taken at the idol by a later writer must not make us doubt the hero's good faith in the matter.²

Dignity and authority tend to become hereditary. It is not surprising that the sons of Gideon should suppose themselves entitled to some prerogatives on account of their father's heroism.

¹ The account of the immense force (thirty-two thousand men) collected by Gideon only to be dismissed (except three hundred), is a late embellishment of the story. The author could conceive how Yahweh could save by a small force, but could not suppose only three hundred men to respond to the call of a divinely appointed leader.

² That the ephod was an object of worship was quite plain to the author of Judg. 8²⁷, who speaks of the worship paid it in terms more forcible than polite. The innocence of such a symbol of Yahweh in this period is made clear by the language of 17¹⁻⁴.

The Canaanitish cities, as we know, were accustomed to the rule of tyrants, either of their own blood, or forced upon them by the crown of Egypt. In the absence of a law of primogeniture, the most ambitious or the least scrupulous son of a chief secures himself in the reversion by the murder of his brothers. Gideon, to be sure, was not a monarch. But such power as he had seemed to one of his sons an object of desire. So the family tragedy that has so often been enacted in the East on the death of a monarch was played on the village stage of Ophrah.

Gideon was blessed with numerous children. Those at Ophrah were of pure Israelite blood. But as the connubium with the Canaanites was established, he had a wife of that stock who chose—according to a well-known form of Semitic marriage—to remain with her own kin at Shechem.¹ Her son was therefore recognised as belonging to their blood. At the same time he was a recognised son of Gideon, and by the patriarchal system in force in Israel he had a claim upon the inheritance. Plausibly representing to the Shechemites the advantage his governorship would give his kindred, this man, Abimelech by name, hired a band of bravos and cut off the Israelite heirs of Gideon, except one lad who made his escape.

Abimelech therefore became Emir of the district. With his band of mercenaries he was probably able to make his authority complete. Our narrative says in so many words that the burghers of Shechem and Beth-millo made him king at the sacred tree in Shechem. Some sort of religious sanction was thus given his usurpation. The caustic fable of Jotham, delivered from the overhanging mountain, taught the people that the most worthless of men are the ones most likely to be intrusted with high office. But it clearly implies the kingship of Abimelech.

The reign, whatever its nature, was short. According to one account it was only three years after Abimelech's installation that God sent an evil spirit between him and his subjects. They asserted their ancient freedom and showed their estimate of the king's peace by plundering the caravans which traversed the country. This, of course, moved the king to take active measures against the unruly. The other account sets forth the revolt in somewhat different terms. One Gaal, Sheikh of a small clan

¹ On the *Sadiga* marriage, which is exemplified in the case of Samson and elsewhere, cf. W. R. Smith, *Kinship and Marriage*, Ch. 3.

of fighting men, took up his residence in Shechem. With the hope of supplanting Abimelech, he began to stir up dissatisfaction. It was the time of the vintage, and the temper of the people—always boisterous at this season—showed itself in seditious speeches, in which Gaal took the lead. Abimelech's Canaanitish blood had advanced him to his position; now his Israelitish blood makes him the subject of abuse. Gaal points out that Abimelech and his lieutenant Zebul are of a race once subject to the Shechemites as slaves. If he (Gaal) were only at the head of affairs, he would openly defy Abimelech, and they would try conclusions on the field of battle. Abimelech was not in Shechem at the time,¹ but the seditious words were reported to him by his deputy, and he marched promptly against the city with his mercenaries. Gaal, under the taunts of Zebul, the deputy, went forth before the eyes of the citizens to make his threats good. His defeat destroyed what prestige he had, and Zebul was able to banish him and the remnant of his troops from the city.

It is perhaps hazardous to combine with this account of the suppression of the revolt the story which follows, of a renewed attack upon the city. We may remember that the revolt was not confined to Gaal and his men, but that the Shechemites had broken the king's peace by plundering the caravans—thus making clear to him that they were resuming their old independence. To suppress this lawlessness, Abimelech could find no better way than to turn his soldiers loose upon the citizens when they came out to their fields. With one company he seized the unguarded gates while the rest were cutting down the townspeople. The sack of the city followed. A neighbouring stronghold bore the name Tower of Shechem, and the people, crowding into it, sought safety from attack, but the tower was burnt over their heads and all of them perished.² At Thebez, also, one of the towns which sympathised in the revolt, an attempt was made to burn the tower in which the people had taken refuge. But here a woman

¹ He had taken up his abode in an otherwise unknown Arumah (Judg. 9⁴¹)—the name should also be restored in v.³¹ (Moore).

² The location of this Tower of Shechem is unknown. It was apparently a separate place—not the citadel of Shechem itself. Thebez has been identified in *Tubaz*, eight miles northeast of Shechem.

threw a millstone from the roof and struck the incautious general to the ground. To avoid the ignominy of death at the hand of a woman he ordered his squire to thrust him through. Thus perished an energetic but unscrupulous ruler. The piety of the Biblical author sees in his death the divine vengeance upon fratricide.

The attention we have given this episode is justified by the light it throws upon the times. We see Israelites and Canaanites settled in immediate proximity, both being cultivators of the soil. The Israelites had earlier been subject to the Canaanites, but, owing to Gideon's generalship, the relations were now reversed. The parties lived together and intermarried, perhaps worshipped the same Baal; but the race feeling was strong. Abimelech, though he raised himself to power by the aid of the Canaanites, was supported mainly by the Israelites. His endeavour to establish a settled government was wrecked partly by race jealousies, partly by the tribal sense of freedom which does not readily tolerate any authority. In the conflict the city of Shechem was destroyed. That Israel also suffered severely can hardly be doubted.¹

The part which an energetic captain can play in a state of society such as we are now considering, is illustrated by Gaal, the leader of the revolt against Abimelech. A more striking instance is that of Jephthah, to whom we come next.² What we learn about him is that he was an outlaw who gathered about him a band of kindred spirits who acknowledged him as captain. Sparing his own people, he fixed his haunts in the region of Bashan. Hence he was recalled by the necessities of his kindred. Chronically at war with their neighbours, these were now deeply involved with the powerful tribe of Ammon. In their extremity, the Sheikhs of Gilead bethought themselves of their exiled brother. A formal proposition was made to Jephthah, and accepted by him, to the effect that he should become their ruler, if only he would

¹ A variant tradition of the destruction of Shechem is contained in the legend of Dinah. With the knowledge at our command, we cannot trace that story to this event. The possibility that this is its origin may, however, be kept in mind.

² As already intimated, the minor judges cannot be taken as historical characters. For this reason we may pass over Tola and Jair, who are mentioned between Abimelech and Jephthah. The names, in fact, seem to be clan names. The reader, however, will be interested in Prof. Cheyne's attempt to transfer a part of Jephthah's story to Jair, *Encyc. Biblica*, s.v. "Jephthah."

defeat the oppressor—in the mind of the writer, at least, the successful warrior attains to something like kingly power. The agreement was solemnly ratified in the sanctuary at Mizpah, and here also Jephthah made the vow, to us so repugnant, that if successful he would sacrifice to Yahweh the first person that should come out of the doors of his house to meet his victorious return. That he intended a human being to be the victim is evident from the form of the vow. If evidence were lacking that human sacrifice was known to the religion of Israel, we should find it here. Nor does the writer of the account revolt from the deed—to him its pathos arises simply from the fact that a young woman perishes in her virginity, and thus the stock of Jephthah is cut off. The view of the time was, no doubt, that the vow was effective in securing the help of Yahweh, just as at a later time Chemosh was roused from his lethargy by a similar sacrifice on the part of the king of Moab.¹

To this pathetic incident and its yearly commemoration, we owe the preservation of the history, which in itself has no great importance. Jephthah's dynasty ended with himself. There is no evidence that his rule (if such we call it) extended beyond the region of Gilead. In any case it had no influence on the main stream of Israel's history. One thing further is noticeable in connexion with it—the turbulence of Ephraim, which tribe took offence at not having been called to the war. Jephthah had not the diplomatic temper of Gideon. The result was a fierce conflict between the two tribes, in which Ephraim was worsted. To the incident our language owes the word Shibboleth—a monument of the test applied by the Gileadites to their brethren. Inability to pronounce according to the prevailing mode has often been inconvenient, seldom fatal as here, though there are some parallel instances known to history.²

¹ 2 Kings 3^{26 f}—the sacrifice brings *great wrath* upon Israel. Had there been no human sacrifices in Israel, the protest embodied in the account of Abraham's offering Isaac would have been needless. A somewhat extended discussion of the subject may be found in Kamphausen's *Verhältniss des Menschenopfers zur Israelitischen Religion* (1896). Recent excavators in Palestine claim to have found evidence of human sacrifice at Gezer—whether in the pre-Israelite period is not yet certain; *Palestine Exploration Fund, Quarterly Statement*, January, 1903, p. 19.

² To the instances given by Moore (*Commentary*, p. 309) may be added one by Doughty, *Arabia Deserta*, I, p. 155. The smallness of the scale

No more extraordinary champion of the cause of religion has arisen in the whole course of history than the one who next claims our attention among the judges of Israel—Samson the son of Manoah. The piety of later times made him, like Isaac or Samuel, a special gift to a mother long disappointed in her hope for children, and described the theophany which gave promise of his greatness. But even the faith of Judaism must have found it difficult to discover Israel's deliverer in this boisterous knight. Samson was anything but a theocratic ruler of God's people. He was not even a deliverer after the pattern of Gideon or Jephthah. It is easy to suppose that the piety of Gideon or Jephthah, different as it was from the piety of later times, exerted a distinct influence in favour of Israel's loyalty to Yahweh. But we can find no trace of such influence exerted by Samson. He is simply a hero of folklore—a champion possessed of great physical strength, who delights in inflicting mischief upon the Philistines; fitful in his rage, and fitful also in his good nature; led by his sensuality into dangerous situations from which he frees himself by unexpected feats; falling a victim to a designing woman, but ending his life with dignity in a supreme effort for revenge.

The discrepancy between the story and its setting is strong evidence for its truthfulness. Certainly the exploits could not have been invented by the authors who have handed the narrative down to us, because the story so poorly teaches the lesson these authors have at heart. Barring a little natural exaggeration therefore, we accept the main incidents as historical, not mythical, only slightly legendary. Their value to us is very great because of the light which they throw upon the life of the time. For the advancement of Israel's nationality they may be said to have no value at all.

The scene of this part of the history is on the western edge of the hill country. Here the tribe of Dan had pushed forward in the front of the Israelite invasion. But they were met by a

on which this history is enacted may be seen when we notice that *Ammán* (Rabbath Ammon) is not more than twenty miles in a straight line from the centre of Gilead. The long argument of Jephthah about Israel's title to Gilead, (Judg. 11¹²⁻²⁸) is not by the author of the main history. The editor in adapting it to its present position, has not observed the fact that it originally referred to a controversy with Moab instead of Ammon.

counter-invasion which had already taken possession of the maritime plain. The Philistines were pirate bands who had ravaged the coasts of Palestine and given much trouble to the Egyptian territories for some time. Like the Northmen of our history, they overran the weaker civilisation of the coast districts, settled among the older inhabitants, and gradually became amalgamated with them. In the fertile grain lands of the Shephela they had made themselves masters, and now formed a confederacy of five bands, under five chiefs or princes. At the time we are considering, they had (like the Hebrews) adopted the language of Canaan.¹ How far customs and religion had been assimilated, cannot clearly be made out; but they alone, among the inhabitants of Canaan, are stigmatised as uncircumcised. After becoming masters of the maritime plain they had attacked the highlands, and had made the nearer tribes of Israel tributaries. Among these the Danites were their nearest neighbours. In the story of Samson we see that the relations between the two peoples were friendly enough. The connubium is recognised—Manoah's protest against Samson's Philistine wife is probably the reflection of later ideas. The Israelites seem to have accepted the situation, paying tribute to escape the harassment of war. A part of the Danites, probably the most adventurous spirits, had preferred to seek a new home in the north, as already related. Those that were left bowed to the Philistine yoke.

Certainly there is no settled enmity where Samson can so easily obtain a wife. The woman's preference for her own kin, shown in the betrayal of the secret of the riddle, is only what may be expected in Oriental society. Samson's outbreaks are acts of private revenge such as might occur in tribal society at any time. Individually he is wronged by his wife's treachery; he leaves her in anger, and is wronged again by her father's giving her to another; individually he takes his revenge on the whole clan by burning up the standing corn.² His people do not make

¹ On the Philistines, besides the commentaries to Judges, compare W. M. Müller, *Asien und Europa*, pp. 387-390, and *Studien zur Vorderasiatischen Geschichte*, II (1900).

² When the grain is dead ripe it is easily set on fire. Modern travellers remark on the care taken by the Fellahin to prevent fire spreading in time of harvest.

Samson's marriage was of the *Sadiga* type already commented upon in the case of Gideon.

the quarrel their own; in fact, when the Philistines demand him, they hand him over for punishment. This does not prevent their enjoyment of his successful feats.

How far the details of these stories are accurate, is a question of minor importance. Our interest in the narrative is excited less by the remarkable incidents than by the religious conceptions revealed. Samson's strength is in his hair. This points to an estimation of the hair of which we have numerous parallels in other religions. In the Old Testament this estimate is most fully expressed in the Nazirite. A Nazirite is a man, who, for a time, is in a state of special ceremonial consecration. As a part of his consecration, and as its external sign, he lets his hair grow long. The Hebrew writer regards Samson as a life-long Nazirite. The only other mark of consecration given in his case, is abstinence from the fruit of the vine. It is clear that this marks his consecration as a consecration to Yahweh, the God of the desert. The vine was sacred to another god, and therefore forbidden.

There is no other Old Testament instance in which long hair is associated with great physical strength; but it is easy to trace the connexion of ideas. Samson's great strength was a special gift of Yahweh. His feats are, in fact, ascribed to a distinct inrush of the Spirit of Yahweh.¹ Should the consecration be broken, the special relation with Yahweh would no longer exist. The cutting of the hair breaks the consecration—"he did not know that Yahweh had departed from him" is the assertion of the text. The mechanical nature of the conception is evident in the sequel, for when the hair grew again, the strength returned. Amazing as it is to us to find a religion in which Yahweh cared more for the hair than for the chastity of His devotee, we are obliged to admit that such a religion existed in Israel in the time of the Judges.

Reviewing the period which we call by the name of the Judges we see that it is really the second stage of the conquest. Israel

¹ Judg. 14^{6, 19}, 15¹⁴. It is a serious question whether, in this period, Yahweh was not identified with the Sun-god. The name Samson indicates consecration to the Sun, to whom there was a sanctuary (Beth Shemesh) in the region.

On the connexion of long hair with religious consecration, see W. R. Smith, *Religion of the Semites*, pp. 305-315, Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, I, p. 193 f., II, 328.

has now made its way into many parts of the land. It has adopted the agricultural life and has some fortified towns of its own. In other towns it lives in conjunction with the Canaanites—probably each race has a separate quarter to itself. Treaties existed which secured the rights of the parties. But in the absence of a central authority these treaties were easily disregarded. Some consciousness there was that all the Israelite clans were of one blood, and that the Canaanites were not of their race. But this consciousness was not strong enough to keep the tribes from warring on each other.

No people ever reached this stage of civilisation without having a literature, and we must suppose that the sagas which have come down to us were already circulated. The sense of unity was probably fostered by the stories of the common ancestor Jacob. The poem which we call the Testament of Jacob dates in part from this period. It describes the situation of the tribes and their character. We hear of Reuben, who still clings to the nomad life, too passionate, too uncontrolled, to attain to anything better. Simeon and Levi are condemned for their ruthlessness and threatened with extinction. Issachar is still under bondage to the Canaanite, a bondage that he threw off under Barak. Dan and Gad are in constant warfare with their neighbours, and Benjamin also lives a freebooter life. Asher, Naphtali, and Ephraim are in possession of a fruitful country from which they obtain abundance of dainties.

We are here a long way from the desert life, and the sagas, as we have seen, reflect the view of the peasant rather than the Bedawy. The curse of Cain is that he lives a nomad; the lot of Jacob is praised above that of Esau. At the same time, the shepherd life has not lost its charm. The Israelite delights in the shrewdness of the arch-shepherd Jacob, his ancestor. So, too, he recounts with admiration and something like awe, Israel's night contest with a divine being, in which the human hero came off conqueror. Such stories fostered the sense of unity among the tribes.

More effective still was the common belief in Yahweh as the God of Israel. In some cases He is thought of as still dwelling in His original home in the south. It is thence that He comes to the help of Israel against Sisera. But He is also active in the land and seems early to have acquired a title to it. It is His

spirit which rushes upon Gideon and Samson and fits them for their work. How far He was identified with the local Baals we cannot clearly make out. But we must suppose that at the sanctuary of Bethel (for example) Yahweh was the God that was worshipped. To Him Gideon consecrated an Ephod, and it was He to whom the unlucky Micah dedicated that image which the Danites appropriated by the right of the strongest.

The question of historical interest was whether the sense of unity, racial and religious, would be able to work out a real political union. At the close of the period the prospect was not hopeful. The incident with which the Book of Judges concludes is calculated to bring this into view and may appropriately open the next chapter.

CHAPTER VII

THE EARLY MONARCHY

IN the first flush of invasion Israel had carried the highlands. But the Canaanites pertinaciously maintained themselves in the plains. The Philistines were seasoned warriors and were able not only to master the maritime plain but also to push their conquests into the hill country. Their relations to Dan we have already discussed. In Benjamin they claimed the supremacy, and their Resident, perhaps supported by a garrison, was established at Gibeah as an instrument for the collection of tribute and a sign of the subjection of Israel. To make common cause against such a foe would seem to be the part of common prudence. And yet the tribes were quarrelling among themselves.

The incoherence of the people who called themselves *Benê Israel* (Sons of Israel) is strikingly brought out by the concluding narrative of the Book of Judges, to which a brief allusion has already been made. Unfortunately the story has been worked over by a later hand so as to teach the very opposite lesson. What we may reasonably suppose to be the original story is something as follows: ¹

A man who dwelt in Mount Ephraim had a wife from Bethlehem. In a fit of anger the woman left him and returned to her father's house. After a time her husband sought her and they were reconciled. The hospitality of the father made it difficult for them to get away, but finally, one afternoon, they made a start. The day was far gone when they reached Jerusalem, and the servant who was with them proposed they should lodge in that city. The master, however, did not trust the hospitality

¹The story in Judges 19-21 shows more marks of late date than any other portion of the book. As it stands, it pictures Israel as a theocratic community, moving as one man under the lead of the priestly oracle, purging out iniquity from its midst, exterminating men, women, and children in the way of duty, yet mourning over the loss of one of the twelve tribes and taking measures to restore it. All this is evidently late. But the kernel of the story seems to be old and this I venture to use.

of Gentiles, and preferred to go on till they should reach an Israelite town. This they found in Gibeah of Benjamin, but not the hospitality for which they looked. No attention was paid them as they stood in the public square, until an old man, not a native of the place, took them to his house. The rest of the people were not content with the sin of omission. They invaded the home of hospitality. By threats of the vilest description they forced the stranger to deliver his wife to them, and her they abused so that she died under their hands.

To the appeal for vengeance, enough Israelites responded to make war upon Benjamin—for this tribe made common cause with the criminals. The result was the almost complete extermination of the tribe. The rest of Israel had forsworn the connubium with them, and the survivors were provided with wives only by a scheme which reminds us of the rape of the Sabines. This is what the author, who lived after the establishment of royal authority, regarded as each man's doing that which was right in his own eyes—inhospitality, violation of the rights of the guest, rape, tribal defence of violence, robbery of maidens from neighbouring towns, internecine conflict. It is probably not accidental that an attempt to remedy these evils was made in the tribe which had suffered most deeply from them.

The narrative of the origin of the kingdom which has come down to us in the Books of Samuel shows a strange confusion in the treatment of this subject. In the looseness of the tribal organisation, which was fitted to cope neither with external evils nor with internal lawlessness, some men must have looked to the monarchy as the institution essential to the prosperity, or indeed the existence, of Israel. Our narrative records such a desire on the part of the people as a whole, but goes on to stigmatise it as contrary to the will of Yahweh. We see here the effect of later experience. The monarchy, in its actual working, fell far short of the ideal. Hence, there grew up the conviction that the theocracy was Israel's true constitution. It is this judgment which has coloured so much of the narrative now before us. Its inconsistency with other parts of the story is evident. To one author, the king was a gift of God to His people; to another, the king was granted only under protest, and as a punishment for the people's sins. There can be no doubt that the former is the older view, and our history must carefully trace the document

in which it appears. This document is, in fact, of the utmost value for the reconstruction of the period.¹

The hero of the narrative is Saul, the son of Kish. He is introduced to us as a man of good family, his father being a well-to-do farmer.² Nobility there was none in Israel, though no doubt purity of blood was highly esteemed, as it always has been among the Arabs. Saul, though he had attained to manhood, was still under the paternal direction and occupied in the work of the farm with apparently no higher ambition, when an errand on which he was sent brought him a new impulse. The asses had strayed, and Saul made a considerable journey to seek them, but without success. As he was about to give up the search, the trusty servant who accompanied him suggested that they inquire of a seer of whom he had heard. This man (Samuel by name) was a member of the class which is found in all stages of society—clairvoyants, mediums, possessors of second sight—to whom those less gifted apply for counsel, direction, or knowledge of the future. The recovery of lost or stolen property has always been one of the things for which they have been consulted. We readily understand how Saul's servant advises a visit to Samuel, how Saul hesitates because he has not the customary honorarium, how, when reassured on this point, he consents to go.

Samuel, however, was more than an ordinary seer. By his strong sense, his probity, and his devotion to the interests of his people he had established himself as the leading man in the little community in which he dwelt. A village feast was at hand, at which the heads of families partook of the common sacrifice. Samuel was the one chosen to preside on this as on all public occasions. As Saul and his servant entered the village they met him going

¹ The composite character of the Books of Samuel (originally one Book) is evident at a glance. For the analysis, the reader may be referred to Budde's *Richter und Samuel*, his edition of the Hebrew text in Haupt's *Sacred Books of the Old Testament* (1894), and the present writer's commentary in the *International Critical Commentary* (1899). On the text, which has suffered much in transmission, use also Wellhausen's *Text der Bücher Samuel's* (1871), and Driver's *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel* (1890). The critical questions of both kinds are also treated in the latest (1903) commentaries of Budde and Nowack.

² He is described as *gibbor hail*, which is erroneously translated *mighty man of valour*. It means, simply, a man who has landed property, and therefore is qualified to bear arms, cf. 2 K. 15¹⁹.

up to the sanctuary. Courteously inviting the strangers to accompany him, he made them the guests of honour at the feast, and afterward took them to his house for the night. In the morning he took Saul aside, and announced the divine choice which made him the deliverer of Israel for whom the people were longing. This message he confirmed by the solemn rite of anointing—a consecration to God which makes the recipient a sacred person.¹

This picturesque anecdote is an early attempt to give the monarchy divine sanction. To understand it fully, we need to take into view its sequel, where we find Saul among the prophets. As he returns to his native town of Gibeah, he meets a company of *Nebiim* coming down from the sanctuary in solemn procession. They are preceded by a band of music and are engaged in the enthusiastic acts of worship associated with so many oriental religions, and exemplified in the ancient Galli as well as the modern dervishes. As Saul meets them, he is overcome by the impulse which possesses them, and himself joins in their extravagances so as to call out the wonder of his fellow-townsmen. In the parallel account² Saul is so entirely possessed by the Spirit that he is incapable of carrying out the plans upon which he has set his heart. He loses all will of his own, and marches on the road laid out for him by a higher power. Arriving at the company of enthusiasts he shares their extravagances even to the stripping off of his garments, and finally, with senses overcome, he lies in a trance all that day and all that night.

We have here one of the most remarkable institutions of Israel's early religion. These raving prophets can be understood only by comparison with their fellows, the Galli and dervishes, to whom reference has already been made. Such prophets are found in the Canaanitish religion, where they dance about the altar. From the Canaanites the institution passed over to Israel. What

¹ The anointing of the sacred pillar at Bethel (Gen. 28¹⁸) gives us light upon the original significance of the act. The rite was very ancient in Canaan according to the El Amarna tablets (Winckler's edition I, p. 99). An extended discussion of the subject is given by Weinel in the *Zeitschr. f. d. Alttest. Wissensch.*, 1898, pp. 1-52.

² 1 Sam. 19¹⁸⁻²⁴ is undoubtedly a later embellishment of the original account which we read in 10⁹⁻¹³. But the embellishments make clear how the original account was understood by the earliest readers.

now interests us is the appearance of the prophets in the history of Saul. We must remember that it was the time of Philistine oppression. If relief was to come, it must come by a new religious impulse. In the earlier time we have seen that a religious impulse brought Israel out of Egypt. It was probably a religious impulse also that nerved the tribes against Sisera. Now, under the Philistine oppression, earnest men began to have accessions of zeal for Yahweh. The zealots (as the dervishes so often have done) stirred up the people, and their enthusiasm became contagious.¹ The monarchy of Saul was the fruit of the revival. This is indicated both by Saul's connexion with Samuel and by his relations with the prophets. The later form of the story joins the two and makes Samuel the head of the prophetic movement.

The part played by Samuel in this account is that of a prophet in the later sense—he is a revealer of the will of God, and the organ by which the new king is appointed. It was inevitable that a later time, looking back to the theocracy as its ideal, should magnify his part in the history of Israel. From this point of view we readily understand the opening chapters of the book of Samuel, for in these chapters Samuel himself appears in the light of a divinely appointed ruler—a second Moses—greater than a Gideon or a Jephthah. In this office of theocratic head of the people he takes his place in the series of Judges, succeeding Eli,

¹ The word which we translate prophet, *nabî*, is yet an unsolved riddle in the Hebrew vocabulary. The most natural hypothesis is that it is a borrowed word. As to the fact of the *nabî*'s enthusiastic or orgiastic behaviour the passage just discussed is sufficient evidence. In the same line is the extravagance of some of the later prophets, the use of the verb 'prophecy' for the raving of a (feigned) madman, and the characterisation of a young prophet as crazy. The dancing of Canaanitish prophets or priests about the altar is the prelude to oracular utterances, cf. *Proceedings of the Soc. Bib. Arch.* XXI, p. 253, and 1 Kings, 18²¹⁻²⁶, where the *prophets* of Baal are described; also W. M. Müller, *Studien zur Vorderasiatischen Geschichte*, II, p. 17. As there was a god Nebo (*Nabu*) in Babylon who was the proclaimer of truth or wisdom, it does not seem far-fetched to connect the *nabî* with him, especially as his worship had spread to Palestine at a very early day—a mountain in Moab and a town in Judah bore his name. The *nabî* would then be *one possessed by Nebo*. On the god Nabu, cf. Jastrow, *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, pp. 124-130; Schrader, *Keilinsch. und Altes Testament*,³ p. 399 ff. Enthusiastic dancing about the altar is one of the earliest expressions of religious emotion. A *Baal of the sacred dance* is known to us from an inscription discovered near Beirut, Bæthgen, *Beiträge zur Semitischen Religionsgeschichte*, p. 25.

whose sons were cut off because of their wickedness. The well-known narrative gives us a charming picture of faith and piety in the person of Hannah. The childless woman comes to the sanctuary to pray for a son, and in her strong desire vows, in case he is granted, to give him to the sanctuary as its servant. The boy is born and faithfully dedicated according to the vow. His fidelity is brought into strong relief by the contrasted conduct of the sons of Eli. These are types of the arrogant priests who care for their office only so far as it fills their bellies. Regardless of ancient custom, they pick for themselves the best pieces of the sacrifices, and with indecent haste send their servants to claim their share even before the sacred rites have been duly performed.¹ Their weak and indulgent father is warned on their account, but in vain. The sons are destroyed in battle; the father is himself killed by shock at the loss of that which he held dearer even than his sons—the Ark of Yahweh. In this tale of disaster Samuel stands out as the faithful servant of Yahweh. While yet a youth he receives a revelation directed against the house of Eli. Later he is favoured with others which establish him in the opinion of the people. Finally he is the recognised vindicator of the people, at whose prayer the Philistines suffer a miraculous defeat, and come no more into the border of Israel.²

This whole account must be received with the greatest caution. If Samuel were the theocratic ruler of the people and at the same time their successful leader against their enemies, what need for the monarchy at all? The answer of the author would be that there was no need for a monarchy; that the call for a king was simply a manifestation of the depravity of the people. This he brings out by making Samuel treat the demand for a king as apostasy from Yahweh. Samuel is in this narrative intended to make Saul superfluous. The construction of history is an ideal one which quite ignores the actual sequence of events.

While we are obliged to resign the Samuel of these earlier chapters, there is one section which may give us some historical

¹ 1 Sam. 2¹²⁻¹⁷. At first sight the passage seems to be ancient. But on reflection we see that the author has no really serious charges to bring against the priests. Contrasting his indictment with that of Hosea, for example, we find it expressive of advanced ritualism and an exaggerated estimate of sacred things.

² 1 Sam. 7¹³. This chapter is certainly late.

material. The scene of Eli's ministration is the sanctuary of Shiloh.¹ This was a substantial structure in which the central sacred object was the Ark, already known to us in the story of the exodus. Eli the priest is, like Samuel, an idealised figure presented to us as one of the Judges of Israel.² When Philistine aggression drove the people to arms, a battle was fought in the country below Shiloh. Israel was defeated in the first collision and the Sheikhs determined to bring the Ark from Shiloh that it might lead them to victory. The position accorded to Yahweh as the God of battles made this a natural step, and if we may trust the history of the exodus, the Ark was from earlier times put in front of the host in order that it might insure the defeat of the enemy. Only so can we understand the ancient cry with which it was greeted :

Rise, Yahweh, and let thine enemies be scattered !
And let thy haters flee before thee !³

The superstition which saw in the Ark a sure pledge of victory was rebuked by the sequel. Whether the Israelites were overconfident or not, the Philistines seem to have fought with the courage of despair. The army of Israel was annihilated ; the bearers of the Ark were slain ; the palladium itself fell into the hands of the enemy ; Shiloh was razed to the ground. The prophet Jeremiah could point to it as an instructive example of God's vengeance upon a place which once He had chosen as His habitation.

The Ark could not long be detained away from its own people. The captors, to show the superiority of their own god, placed it as a trophy in the Temple of Dagon.⁴ But mysterious visitations upon the idol made them uneasy in the suspicion that after all Yahweh might be the stronger. The suspicion was confirmed by an outbreak of the bubonic plague in the city where the Ark was detained. Suspicion became certainty when the

¹ The locality which still bears the name *Seilun* is accurately described in Judg. 21¹⁹ ; cf. Moore's note on the passage and his references.

² 1 Sam. 4¹⁸, a redactional insertion, but one which correctly interprets the traditional position of Eli.

³ Num. 10³⁵ ; the section is ascribed to J by the majority of critics.

⁴ The nature of this Philistine divinity is still obscure. His name occurs in Assyrian, cf. Jastrow, *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, p. 208 f.

plague followed the route which the Ark took when sent from city to city. At last the popular terror became uncontrollable. The chiefs were compelled to return the dangerous emblem or depository of superhuman power. Every effort was now made to conciliate the offended deity. A suitable votive offering was prepared and placed with the Ark itself upon a new, and therefore unpolluted, cart. The untaught kine obeyed the divine impulse and took the nearest way to the territory of Israel.¹

The sacred object was able to show its power on friends as well as foes. At Beth-shemesh its death-dealing holiness proved destructive to seventy men, and the people hastened to get rid of so dangerous a treasure. At Kirjath-jearim, whither it was carried, it was more placable or was better treated, and here it rested till the time of David.² There is some confusion in the sources as to the name of the place, which is later called Baal Judah. As we know Kirjath-jearim to have been one of the Canaanite cities to a comparatively late date, we may conjecture that this accounts for the change of name in the narrative of David's life.

Is this incident of the capture and return of the Ark historical? Serious objection is made to it by some scholars on the ground that if once captured the Ark was not likely to be restored. That it should be captured is not improbable. It was the custom to carry it into battle. We cannot suppose it impossible that it should ever fall into the hands of the enemy. We cannot account for the story of its capture without some basis of fact—the pride of Israel would have resented the invention of such a story. And, if captured, there is no reason why it might not make the impression which is so vividly described in the narrative. The God of Israel had more than once shown His power. A plague breaking out about the time of the capture would quite certainly be interpreted as the stroke of His wrath. To send Him back to His own people would be the dictate of common prudence. The sobriety of the narrative is seen in its limiting the power of Yahweh to the pestilence, and not making Him

¹ According to Bavarian legend the corpse of Saint Emmeram was in like manner committed to a yoke of oxen, who were allowed to choose their own way; Usener, *Religionsgesch. Untersuchungen*, III., p. 137.

² 1 Sam. 5¹⁻⁷. The section is older than the narrative in which it is imbedded.

overthrow the armies of the Philistines in some public way. The same sobriety is seen in the position which is given the Ark itself. The sacred object is not made the sole and central symbol of the Godhead to all Israel. The loss of it did not affect the chief sanctuaries in the least, nor did its return make Kirjath-jearim the only place of legitimate worship. Samuel never visited it after its return, never tried to restore it to his own tribe or city. Saul paid it no attention. In all these respects we see that our narrative has been kept free from the representations of a later age.

The incident of the capture of the Ark is calculated to give us a vivid conception of the Philistine power. If that power was sufficient to carry off the Ark and conquer its defenders in a pitched battle, what might it not accomplish? In truth, the Philistine oppression was severe, and its severity was not mitigated by the infliction of the plague. The paragraph in the history which speaks of the Israelites as being totally disarmed, is indeed an exaggeration. But the fact that a Philistine Resident was stationed at Gibeah, in the very heart of Benjamin, shows the galling nature of the foreign yoke. From this yoke Saul sought to deliver Israel, and though he himself accomplished little, he kept the spirit of the nation alive, and prepared the way for his greater successor. It has been his misfortune that his exploits have been compared with those of this successor.

The kingship was not, as a matter of fact, conferred upon Saul by the word of Samuel. The election by lot, which is related in connexion with the demand of the people for a king, is an imaginative construction of legend. Saul became king by an act of prowess like that which brought Gideon into prominence in Israel. It was again the Bedawin which gave occasion for a great deed. The Ammonites made a raid upon their Israelite neighbours, besieging Jabesh Gilead.¹ The townsmen, rather than see their country devastated, offered to make an arrangement such as often existed between two tribes in that period. They doubtless expected to pay tribute as the price of peace—the proposition was in line with what Israelites and Canaanites had often done. But Nahash, the Sheikh of the invaders, insisted on terms hitherto unheard of. He would put out the right eye of

¹ *Wadi Yabis*, which falls into the Jordan valley about twenty miles south of the Lake of Galilee, seems to preserve the ancient name.

every male in the town, and would "lay it as a reproach on all Israel." The sarcasm which Arab poets know how to pour upon cowardice, sufficiently shows what Israel would suffer in case this outrage were inflicted upon their brethren. Whether Nahash had a personal wrong to avenge (it has been suggested that he himself had lost an eye in battle), or whether it was a case of sheer barbarity, we cannot now determine. Secure in the supposed weakness of Israel, he allowed the men of Jabesh to seek help among their kin. Messengers hastened across the Jordan, probably with no very sanguine hopes of rallying their disunited brethren to their support.

It was with no thought of Saul's authority or influence that the messengers came to Gibeah, for the king assumed neither authority nor title.¹ After the religious exaltation of his meeting with the dervishes, he had quietly returned to the work of the field. When the news came of the hard fate of Jabesh, the people broke out in weeping, but no one thought of sending for Saul. It was only as he returned from his day's work that he discovered the commotion, and learned its cause. Then a mighty impulse seized him. The Spirit of God *rushed upon him*² as it used to rush upon Samson. He hewed his oxen in pieces, and sent the pieces to all Israel with the message: "Whosoever comes not after Saul, so shall his oxen be treated." The answer was a muster of the people so prompt, that the Ammonites were taken by surprise and thoroughly routed. The deliverance of Jabesh was complete, and, as in the cases of Gideon and Jephthah, the event marked Saul as the divinely chosen chief of the people. With Saul, however, there was a distinct advance. The assumption of the title of king showed a purpose to inaugurate a more stable government than had existed before. To the people, first and last, the chief office of the king was to lead them in battle against their enemies. The new dignity was conferred at the ancient sanctuary

¹ There is a possibility, however, that Jabesh and Benjamin regarded themselves as closely akin. The account of the attack of the other tribes upon Benjamin tells of the Benjamites receiving wives from Jabesh (Judg. 21⁶⁻¹⁵), and the piety of the Jabeshites toward Saul after his death argues for some uncommon bond of union. The elaborate conclusions of Winckler, however (*Keilinschriften und Altes Testament*³, p. 227, and *Geschichte Israels*, II, pp. 155-158), seem to rest on a slender basis.

² 1 Sam. 11⁶, Judg. 14^{6, 19}, 15¹⁴; the verb is the same in the four passages.

of Gilgal, where, after offering sacrifices, Saul and the men of Israel rejoiced exceedingly.¹

That Israel should weaken itself by fighting with Ammon, could be looked upon only with pleasure by the Philistines. The organisation of Benjamin under a king was also a small matter in their eyes. How the internal affairs of their tributaries were conducted did not concern them, so long as the tribute was not endangered. The kingship of Saul can hardly have been recognised (at least at first) beyond the boundaries of his own tribe. The haughty and turbulent Ephraimites were not likely to submit to him, and Judah, as we know, was only very loosely connected with Israel. We may suppose that the new king spent some time quietly in establishing his power before he ventured to try conclusions with the main enemy. Our narrative is silent except with regard to the leading events, and gives us no clew as to the chronology of the period. It tells us only that Saul enlisted three thousand men, with whom he garrisoned Bethel, Michmash, and Geba.² These were important points for the control of the highways, both the one running north and south, and the one running across the country into the Jordan valley. As the security of the roads is one of the chief cares of the king, this measure is quite intelligible. These fortresses were also well situated to discover and check any invading force.

When we first met Saul, he was described to us as a young man. The next adventure presents him as more mature in years, father of a son who is capable of bearing arms—the well-known and well-beloved Jonathan.³ The name tempts us to linger, for the Old Testament writers have dealt lovingly with it. We find the young man presented as the paragon of friendship, the

¹ The story of the relief of Jabesh (I Sam. 11) is ancient, and the substance may well be taken for authentic history. In the received text are some interpolations, designed to harmonise its statements with the other document with which it is combined. Samuel was originally unknown to it, but has been introduced in the process of redaction. In the correct reading, it dates the relief of Jabesh about a month after Saul's first anointing. The enormous numbers of Saul's militia must be judged like similar data elsewhere.

² As David had a body-guard of only six hundred men, we may suspect the three thousand to be an exaggeration.

³ *Whom Yahweh gave* is the meaning of the name. Saul's piety is manifested in all the names he gave his sons.

loving and generous prince who could rejoice that he was to be supplanted in the kingdom by his friend David. At his first introduction to us the shadow has not yet begun to fall over his life. He is the intrepid warrior, without whose impetuosity Saul might never have broken with the Philistines. It was Jonathan who struck the first blow for freedom. As crown prince he had command of the troops at Geba. The place is on the south side of a wadi running up from the Jordan valley. At this place the Philistine Resident was stationed, a constant provocation to the young soldier. Impatience getting the upper hand, Jonathan slew the agent of oppression with his own hand. The act of revolt needed no interpreter, and the Philistines promptly moved into the hill country. Coming from the north (as would appear), they forced Saul to evacuate two of his posts—Bethel and Michmash. Geba, however, was protected by the ravine which ran between it and Michmash, and its garrison could not so easily be dispossessed. Saul's men deserted in numbers, and his force was reduced to six hundred men. With these he held Geba, but was unable to take the offensive, or even to check the devastation of the country. After the manner of Oriental (and also of Occidental) warfare, the Philistine bands harried the country. From the fixed camp at Michmash, where they could hold the Benjamites in check, they daily sent out parties of raiders to the north, east, and west. These, with settled purpose, looted, killed, and burned whatever belonged to Israel.

A bold stroke by Jonathan brought light into the darkness which seemed settling upon Israel. From the camp at Geba he could look across the ravine and see what was doing at Michmash.¹ There the advance post of the Philistines was stationed on the edge of the cliff overlooking the ravine. The young soldier could not help thinking what a fine thing it would be to give them a fright, and the thought became a resolve.

As was appropriate to a prince and an officer, Jonathan had a squire or adjutant—*armour-bearer* is the Hebrew title—who fought by his side.² Such an officer naturally became the con-

¹ It is acutely conjectured by Duff (*Old Testament Theology*, II, p. 223) that the name means *Place of Chemosh*. Chemosh was the god of Moab, and the name might have been given during the Moabite invasion from which deliverance was wrought by Ehud.

² We have already met such an officer in the case of Abimelech, Judg. 9⁵⁴.

fidential friend of his chief; so we are not surprised to find Jonathan confiding his plans to him. What he proposes is that they quietly make their way to the bottom of the ravine and then show themselves in the open. If the sentinels observe them and banter them to climb the slope they will take it as Yahweh's omen that they are to make the attempt. The squire is in no way behind his chief in ambition, and readily seconds the plan. The result is as Jonathan expected. The sentinels seeing the young men below them, amuse themselves with watching the "Hebrews coming out of their holes." Then they shout: "Come up hither and we will show you something." This is the looked-for omen, and in the confidence that it is a sign from Yahweh, the two warriors scramble up the cliff. The men of the outpost are taken aback by the unexpected move. Uncertain whether there may not be a large force swarming up the slope, they hesitate, then turn to flee. The active Jonathan, "swifter than an eagle," as he is described later,¹ pursues, overtakes, beats down, and with the help of his adjutant soon puts some twenty men beyond the power of doing harm.

The undisciplined armies of the East are easily thrown into a panic. The force of Philistines on this occasion was a miscellaneous body drawn together by the hope of plunder. Besides Philistines and Canaanites it contained many Hebrews, who were pressed into the service either as slaves or burden-bearers, or who had feigned zeal for their Philistine superiors. It is hardly surprising that the main camp was thrown into confusion by the sudden attack upon the outpost. The piety of the Israelites was sure that an earthquake was felt, and this they interpreted as the signal of Yahweh's coming to the aid of His people. This party in the camp was therefore ready to strike a blow for freedom, while the Philistines, uncertain whom to trust, turned their swords against friend and foe without discrimination. As Saul from the not distant Geba heard the thunder of the captains and the shouting, and looked to see what it meant, he saw, not the dreaded ranks ready to march, but a mob surging hither and yonder in aimless and ridiculous confusion.

The pious king was not willing to move without some indication of the will of God. The priest Ahitub was with the army, carrying the ephod by which the mind of Yahweh could be as-

¹ In David's lament, 2 Sam. 1²³.

certained.¹ First the troops were mustered, and the roll call showed the absence of Jonathan and his aid. Then the ephod was brought, and the ceremonies preparatory to the consultation of the oracle were gone through, or at least begun. Meanwhile the confusion in the camp of the enemy kept increasing. The circumstances seemed to indicate the will of Yahweh plainly enough. Without waiting for the special revelation therefore, Saul decided to seize the golden moment. Directing the priest to suspend the service, he marched at the head of his little band against the Philistines. The time was indeed opportune; the Philistines were in utter confusion; the Hebrews in the camp—slaves or hangers-on—had turned against their masters. The host was melting away; what held together was making its way westward toward the Philistine country. Saul and his men had nothing to do but to follow and slay. As the fleeing and pursuing companies made their way over the country, Saul was continually reinforced by those Israelites who had kept in hiding or had heretofore avoided taking sides in the war. The day was a day of victory for Israel.

The vividness with which the narrative brings before us the conditions of ancient Palestinian warfare must be my excuse for reproducing it at such length. No other of the battles of Israel is so fully described for us, but many must have been fought in substantially the same manner. Nor is it the battle alone that throws light upon the condition of the people at this time. The sequel is at least equally interesting. Saul, as we have seen, left the consultation of the oracle incomplete. But, either to conciliate the God whose oracle he was thus treating cavalierly, or else to secure His favour by a special example of self-denial, the king laid upon his soldiers the vow of abstinence. "Cursed be every one who shall eat food till evening, till I be avenged on my enemies." The solemn *Amen* of the people ratified the vow. Doubtless by this vow the soldiers were kept from plundering and so delaying or endangering the victory. But we can hardly suppose that this was Saul's main idea. His purpose was to impose a taboo, with the idea that this in itself was an act well pleasing to God.²

¹ The ephod has been discussed above in connexion with the story of Gideon. It had some relation with the sacred lot which we shall meet again.

² Vows of abstinence are not unusual among the Arabs in going to war. cf. Procksch, *Die Bluttrache bei den Vorislamischen Arabern* (1899), p. 5.

The effort did not result as had been anticipated. The people, exhausted by pursuing and fighting, and unrefreshed by food, were unable to do effective execution on their foes. Moreover, when the period of taboo was ended by the going down of the sun, the famished people flew upon the captured cattle, slew and ate. The care in disposing of the blood, which is enjoined in all religions, conspicuously in the religion of Israel, was found to be lacking. Saul was the first to regret this profane haste. He ordered an altar to be extemporised, and warned the people by heralds to bring to it the animals they had in hand, that their eating might be in accordance with the customs of religion.¹

The unfortunate results of the vow were not yet fully manifest. After the refreshment of the soldiers Saul proposed a night attack upon what was left of the Philistine force. The oracle was again appealed to, but no response could be had. The conclusion was easily drawn that some one had violated the taboo and that Yahweh was angry. As a matter of fact the taboo had been violated; Jonathan, who had not been present at its imposition, had eaten a little honey from an abandoned hive. When he was informed of the state of the case he ceased eating, though convinced that his father had been unwise in forcing the people to fight all day without food. Jonathan's transgression, unwitting though it was, brought guilt upon the people, and the anger of Yahweh was accounted for. That anger could be removed only by the death of the offender. To discover the guilty person, the sacred lot was again brought into play. Saul and Jonathan were in one group, the body of the soldiers in the other. The lot fell upon

The fasting before a battle can hardly be said to be parallel to the present case, Judg. 20²⁶, 1 Sam. 7⁶. One is reminded, however, of the vow taken by the zealots not to eat or drink till they had killed the Apostle Paul, Acts 23¹²⁻¹⁵.

¹ The story of the battle and taboo is found in 1 Sam. 13¹⁻¹⁴ 35. As we read it in the received text, it is disfigured by insertions from a later hand, which make it almost unintelligible. The chief of these is the account of the rejection of Saul, 13⁸⁻¹⁵. This is a construction of religious bias: a later writer believed that Saul was rejected by Yahweh, the ground of the belief being that he did not succeed in establishing a dynasty. It required little logical power to conclude that the rejection was because of disobedience to Samuel, the chosen organ of divine revelation. Hence the paragraph in question. Less disturbing is the insertion 13¹⁹⁻²², though it gives an exaggerated view of the situation. The text of the chapters is corrupt in several places, as is pointed out in the commentaries.

the royal party. The people expostulated against going on, fearful of losing either their king or the hero of the day. But Saul would not consent to anything less than the complete issue of the case; the lot was cast again and fell upon Jonathan.¹ The king would doubtless have offered himself as the victim had he been the one pointed out. Jonathan freely confessed his unwitting transgression and chivalrously offered to die. But the people could not reconcile themselves to the death of their hero. They tumultuously revolted against the carrying out of the sentence, and by offering a substitute redeemed the prince from the fate that hung over him.² Of course, the night was too far spent to think of further pursuit or battle. A further attempt against the Philistines seems not to have been made at this time.

The Hebrew historians, like ancient historians in general, were interested in battles and the fortunes or misfortunes of their heroes. They do not tell us what we would most like to know. We may readily suppose that the decisive victory we have been considering gave substantial relief from Philistine oppression—it is evidence to this effect that we hear no more of Philistine Residents in Benjamin. But what Saul did for the organisation of the kingdom is left untold. Probably social relations remained much as they had been, except that an appeal could be taken to the king as the judge of last resort. Saul's court and household were on the most modest scale, and we hear nothing of his laying taxes on his subjects. The extent of his kingdom is quite unknown. All that we are told of his acts is that he enlisted every valiant man in his service. This implies that his was a predatory kingdom, his own revenue and the support of his men coming from the raids in which he kept his troops busy. There is an intimation that David was at one time kept constantly on such service. The Philistines, the Canaanites, the Amalekites and other nomad tribes would furnish objects enough for such excursions.

¹ The passage, 1 Sam. 14³⁶⁻⁴⁵, in the form in which the Greek translators read it, gives us the best account of the sacred lot (the *urim and thummim*) which we have anywhere in the Old Testament. It does not say in so many words that the ephod is the receptacle for the oracular stones, but that is the natural conclusion. A discussion of the Biblical material with reference to Babylonian analogies is given by W. Muss-Arnolt, "The Urim and Thummim," in the *Amer. Journal of Semitic Languages* (1900), pp. 193-224.

² That it was a *human* substitute is not expressly stated in the text, but all the probabilities point toward such an one.

sions. Our present narrative adds to these the Moabites, the Ammonites, and the Syrians, and there is no improbability in Saul's leading forays into the regions occupied by these peoples.

In the oldest document we hear no more of pitched battles till we come to the end of Saul's life. The interest of our informants turns to a new hero. David, a Bethlehemite and a member of the tribe of Judah, is the man who, from his introduction to the court of Saul, becomes the central figure of the story. It is doubtful whether his tribe was included in the kingdom of Saul, though the relations between Judah and the rest of Israel were friendly. The account of David's coming to court reveals the shadow which was already overhanging the house of Saul. The abnormal nervous constitution of the king, which had shown itself in unusual religious exaltation, now manifested itself in another way. The Spirit of Yahweh began to trouble him with fits of depression, sometimes rising to acute mania, in which, as one beside himself, he raved in his tent. The symptoms which in his religious exaltation were interpreted as indicating the favour of Yahweh now gave rise to anxiety, as though his God had turned against him. His peace of mind was gone, and his irresponsible moods might easily become dangerous to those about him. The only thing that his officers could think of as likely to give relief was music, and they therefore advised the employment of a court musician. One of them was ready to recommend his friend David, who was already a soldier of repute, a man of affairs and of good presence, as well as a skilful player on the harp. He was sent for, and he came to court with a modest gift sent by his father to the king.¹ His musical talent gave satisfaction. Whenever the troublesome Spirit came upon Saul in fits which threatened to suffocate him, then "David would take the lyre and play, and Saul would breathe freely and be well."² Nor was it the young man's music alone that commended him. The personal qualities of which his friend had

¹ It was not good form to approach the king without bringing a present, which was generally in kind. Jesse sent ten loaves of bread, a kid, and a skin of wine.

² 1 Sam. 16²³. The verse adds *and the spirit of evil would depart from him*. The phrase *spirit of evil* conveys a wrong impression to us. The passage makes it abundantly clear that the spirit was the Spirit of Yahweh, but the author calls it a spirit of evil because it was sent to inflict evil on Saul.

boasted proved to be real, and they endeared him to his king. Saul loved him, we are told, and made him his adjutant, thus giving him a place where he might always be near his person. The judgment of Saul was shared by the people at large, with whom David became a favourite.

The mind of princes is proverbially fickle, and in the morbid state in which Saul was, we can hardly wonder that his love soon gave place to jealousy. The consciousness that his health was undermined would only increase his sensitiveness, and the sensitiveness would not long lack occasion. What finally affected him we can no longer make out—the story of Goliath is a late invention. The earliest of our sources relates how on the return of the army from one of their forays, the women danced out to meet the victors singing the couplet :

“ Saul slew his thousands,
And David his ten thousands.”

But the account is not easy to credit. The couplet is probably one current at a later time, to express the comparative merits of the two kings. Native good sense would keep the people from such a breach of etiquette as they would commit by singing such a song in Saul's presence. Even supposing that David's youth gave him especial advantages in the eyes of the singers, they must have known that extravagant praise would bring the hero into an equivocal position. Nor would David's own modesty have permitted this preference of himself to his prince.

We are compelled to confess our ignorance of any particular occasion for jealousy ; the jealousy itself was a serious fact. In one of the insane fits which came upon the king, he attempted his servant's life—hurling the javelin at him as he played. This failing (and perhaps being excused as a deed done under an insane impulse), the king removed David from close attendance upon his person, and gave him a command in the field. His hope was that the accidents of war would take his rival out of the way. But David thrived upon the accidents of war ; they served only to bring out his prowess and his ability as a commander. The devotion of the people became more marked than ever.

The element of romance was infused into the situation by Saul's daughter Michal, whose heart was captivated by the youthful hero. Her affection could not be concealed from those about

her, and, coming to the ears of the king, it suggested a way to get rid of the now hated officer. The courtiers were directed to sound David on the question of becoming the king's son-in-law. When David, with modesty and good sense, explains that he cannot pay the price which the king would have the right to expect for his daughter, he is told that the king will take his pay in the lives of his enemies. One hundred of these, vouched for in a way that will satisfy the king, is all the dowry that is asked.¹ The secret hope of the bargainer is, that the aspirant will pay with his own life for the one hundred which he plans to take. The event brought disappointment; the price was paid at the time stipulated, and the king had no excuse for withholding his daughter.

But now the hostility breaks out violently and openly. The king, maddened by his failure, sends to the house where David has just taken possession of his bride. Not able to wait until morning to cool his rage, he commands his satellites to violate the privacy of the home—a gross outrage, according to Oriental ideas as well as our own. They are to bring David to him, so that he may personally take vengeance. But the king's temper had not escaped the observation of his daughter. She is in no mind to be mocked with a husband, and therefore urges David to escape while it is yet time. With her own hand she lets him down from an unobserved window, and he disappears in the darkness. To gain time for him, she uses the Teraphim—the household god which at this period stood at every Israelite hearth.² This we must suppose to be a rude image in human form. Wrapping this effigy in a garment, as the Oriental wraps himself when he sleeps, she places it in David's bed. She then meets the messengers who demand her husband, and tells them he is ill. As the king will brook no de-

¹ The fact already noted, that the Philistines were the only uncircumcised people of Palestine, accounts for the extraordinary nature of the vouchers stipulated.

That a father expected to be paid for his daughters, is evident from the case of Laban, as well as from the regulations of the Book of the Covenant (Ex. 21⁷⁻¹¹, 22¹⁶). On Arabic analogies, cf. Wellhausen, "Die Ehe bei den Arabern" in the *Nachrichten der Götting. Gesellsch. der Wissenschaften* (1893) p. 433 ff.

² The Teraphim appear in the history of Jacob, where they are mildly disapproved. So late as Hosea they seem to be associated with the altar of Yahweh, Hos. 3⁴, cf. also Judg. 17⁵, 18¹⁷ ff.

lay, the stratagem avails little. Michal is compelled to prevaricate in order to save her own life from her angry father.¹

With this incident, David becomes the leading character of the story. We hear little more of Saul, except that his pursuit of his rival becomes a monomania. The most melancholy incident of his career—until the supreme struggle in which he loses his life—is the massacre of the priests of Nob. The town thus named was not far from Gibeah, and was a religious centre. All members of the clan that possessed it seem to have had priestly qualifications. Their chief is identified, on somewhat precarious grounds, with a grandson of Eli. When David was on his flight from Saul, he received aid and comfort from this priest. The report was brought to Saul at the time when he was irritated to the pitch of insanity by David's escape. Certainly the kindness of the priest looked like more than ordinary friendship. Suspecting conspiracy, the king summoned all the adult males of the clan—eighty-five men in number. Without listening to their defence, he had them all put to death. The account which has come down to us affirms that he also sacked the town, and put the whole population to the sword, without sparing age or sex.² This outbreak of

¹ The chapters of 1 Samuel which relate the fortunes of David in this period present complicated problems, some of which still await solution. The repeated flights and escapes of David show that more than two accounts have been combined. In the story of Goliath, the fact of interpolation is made clear by the testimony of the Greek version. The story in any form is legendary—the representation of Saul's abject terror, of David's lack of experience, of Saul's ignorance of the lad, of Jonathan's sudden friendship, speak too loudly to be misunderstood.

I have passed by the second account of Saul's rejection (1 Sam. 15) as also thoroughly unhistorical. But I do not mean to affirm that there is no real incident at the basis of the story. The sacrifice of Agag "before Yahweh" at Gilgal is quite comprehensible as the fulfilment of a vow made on going into battle—the parallel case of Jephthah has already been considered; cf. Schwally, *Kriegsaltertümer*, I, p. 34.

² The story of the massacre, 1 Sam. 22⁶⁻¹⁹, bears all the marks of historicity. The section introductory to it which relates David's interview with the priest, may have been influenced by the author's desire to set David in a favourable light. The giving of the consecrated bread is, to his mind, a divine indication that David is already a consecrated person—the king bore that character as we have seen. It may be doubted whether the priest was as innocent as the narrative would make him out.

For historical purposes, we are obliged to pass by the account of David's flight to Samuel at Ramah (19¹⁸⁻²⁴), and also the elaborate intercession of Jonathan in chapter 20.

rage is only too comprehensible. But it does not seem seriously to have weakened the king's hold upon his people.

Saul maintained himself against external and internal foes for some years. His early chronicler affirms that he made war against Moab, Ammon, Edom, the kings of Zoba and the Philistines, and that *wherever he turned he was victorious*.¹ Such an impression could not have been made had the king's life been mainly taken up with fits of madness and fruitless expeditions after a runaway servant. Perhaps we may conclude something from the final effort of the Philistines. They found it impossible to invade the country of Benjamin directly, because Saul too vigilantly guarded all the approaches. Hence their march to the Great Plain, where they could use their chariots. The account which has come down to us makes a digression to tell of the fortunes of David. He and his men had been ordered by Achish, in whose service they were, to march with the Philistine forces. The dilemma in which he was placed—he must either fight against his kinsmen or betray the cause in which he was enlisted—was removed by the suspicions of the Philistine generals. Doubtless they remembered the experience at Michmash, when their slaves and auxiliaries turned against them.

Later story threw over the last days of Saul's life the shadow of his coming doom. In this narrative a necromancer is made to bring back Samuel from the realm of shades to pronounce again the sentence of rejection. The interview is the final scene in the life of a rebel against God, delivered over to despair by the shade of the prophet whom he has disobeyed. The chapter is of the utmost value as showing popular ideas concerning intercourse with the dead. But its pitiless consistency in following a theological idea deprives it of all value for the history of Saul.²

The Philistines had mustered all the force they could command, with the determination to crush out the independence of Israel. There was nothing left for Saul except to lead a forlorn hope.

¹ 1 Sam. 14⁴⁷. The verse is the concluding panegyric of an ancient life of Saul. For *Edom* in this passage, however, we should probably read *Aram*. Edom was too remote to be reached by Saul.

² To the older commentators the story presented difficulties of the gravest sort, for that the author believed in the actual raising of Samuel's shade must be obvious. The difficulties disappear when we discover that the chapter is only the dramatic embodiment of an idea. It is poetic consistency to make Samuel dead repeat the rejection pronounced by Samuel living.

He died fighting for the cause to which he had given so large a part of his life. Two accounts of his death have come down to us. One asserts that he saw his defeat and the death of his sons, and that he was himself wounded. In these desperate circumstances he urged his armour-bearer to despatch him,¹ lest he fall alive into the hands of the enemy. When this officer refused to obey the order he threw himself upon his own sword. The other account makes an Amalekite camp follower give him the finishing stroke. It may be doubted whether either is accurate. All we can assert with confidence is that Saul and the able-bodied men of his house died on the field of honour.

For the time the cause seemed lost; but we may well believe that its hero had not lived in vain. He marked out the path in which his greater successor was to follow. Later times judged him too severely, making success the test of the divine favour. The light we have on his career is uncertain and perplexing, partly because it was outshone by the brilliancy of David's history, partly because Saul himself was a perplexing character. His whole-hearted devotion to the unity and independence of Israel, and his sincere piety, were offset by less admirable qualities. The jealousy that tormented him is the natural failing of a self-made man. The ruthlessness of his treatment of Nob shows a temptation to which almost every absolute ruler at some time gives way. Even his zeal for Israel was not always a zeal according to knowledge, for, contrary to right and the common conscience, he endeavoured to exterminate the Gibeonites.

These Canaanites were protected by a solemn league and covenant. Saul, in his zeal for Israel, thought the covenant could be disregarded, and took steps to wipe out the foreigners. How far he went, or what checked him, we do not know. A famine in the time of David was interpreted as a vindication of the rights of the allies—Yahweh was not unmindful of the oath to which he was made a party. The blood brought by Saul upon his house was therefore purged by the hanging up of his sons before Yahweh in Gibeon. We are not to infer that the conscience of Saul was altogether seared. His obtuseness was the obtuseness of the times in which he lived.

The able-bodied men of Saul's family perished with him in

¹ Cf. the case of Abimelech already described, and the parallel instance of a Babylonian king, *Keilinsch. Bibliothek*, II, p. 137.

the battle of Gilboa. Abner, Saul's general, seems to have found discretion the better part of valour. Himself escaping, he carried Ishbaal—Saul's surviving son, a weakling in body and mind—across the Jordan. Here, at the ancient Israelite town of Mahanaim, he was able to set up the semblance of a kingdom, with Ishbaal as its head. The Philistines were masters of the country between the Jordan and the sea, but they seem to have allowed Ishbaal some sort of jurisdiction on payment of tribute. David was rising into prominence in the south, but he was to appearance wholly devoted to the Philistine interest. It could only give pleasure to the overlords to see the two subject kingdoms keep each other in check, and exhaust their strength by making war on each other.

Before turning to David we may notice with sympathy the men of Jabesh Gilead. After the battle of Gilboa, the victors sent the armour of Saul to their chief temple as a trophy. His body they hung up in derision on the walls of Beth-shan. The men of Jabesh were not unmindful of their debt to their deliverer. In a night expedition they rescued the bones of Saul from the ignominious exposure, brought them to their own town, and buried them under a conspicuous tree, with appropriate expressions of grief. Not all republics are ungrateful.

CHAPTER VIII

DAVID

WE have already met the son of Jesse at the court of Saul, whither he came as court musician. That a celebrated warrior may also be a skilled musician is proved by many examples in history. Tradition has delighted to embellish the career of this warrior-minstrel, so that it is difficult for us to discover the actual course of his life. If we content ourselves with selecting what seems most authentic in the story that has come down to us, we shall have a result something as follows:

The young officer was placed by Saul first in a confidential position where he became acquainted with the life of the court. He was then given a post of danger where he was schooled in the art of war. The growing jealousy of the king taught him circumspection. When he was at last compelled to flee the court and to depend on himself, he was able to cope with adversity, to find resources in himself, and to maintain his influence over the turbulent spirits which came to share his outlawry. The nucleus of the band of which he soon became the head was formed by his own kinsmen. In an unsettled state of society such as then prevailed, a masterful spirit easily becomes the head of a band like-minded with himself.¹ Jephthah is a case in point. The kingdom of Damascus was founded later by such a freebooter.

The Wilderness of Judah—the country along the western shore of the Dead Sea—is adapted to furnish refuge to such bands. Descending upon the cultivated country in a sudden raid, the troop disappears in the trackless waste, only to make a new attack in an unexpected quarter. To the south the wilderness of Kadesh offers additional security. Edom and Amalek were hereditary enemies of David, and the numerous Bedawin clans, often hostile to each other, were just strong enough to make the

¹ Arabic history shows numerous similar cases, of which one is the famous poet Imru'l-Kais, cited by Procksch, *Blutrache*, p. 32.

work of plunder interesting. Blackmail has always been regarded as legitimate in border warfare, and that David did not hesitate to levy it is shown by the anecdote of Nabal. This man was one of the great sheep-masters of Southern Palestine, a Calebite by race, his tribe not yet reckoned a part of Judah. His home was Carmel, in a rolling country, part of which is cultivable, the rest furnishes excellent pasture.¹

The time of sheep-shearing is a time of feasting and rejoicing. The Bedawy Sheikh still expects generous hospitality, or a gift from the shepherd at this season. David, therefore, sent an embassy to Nabal asking for *Baksheesh*. The ground given was first, that his band had respected Nabal's rights, not exercising the right of the strongest; secondly, they had protected Nabal's property from other wandering bands which might have been troublesome. What David claimed was in fact protection money, only he asked it in kind instead of in coin. But Nabal, strong in the consciousness of possession, turned the messengers away with a surly reply: "Who is David? Who is the son of Jesse? There are many slaves in these days who run away from their masters. And I must take my bread and my wine and the flesh which I have killed for my shearers, and give them to men of whom I know nothing!" The taunt and the refusal aroused David's anger, and hastily arming a part of his force he was on the point of quenching his rage in the blood of the man who had insulted him.

The good sense with which Nabal's wife met the crisis, and the skill with which she dissuaded David from staining his conscience with blood, may be read in the narrative. To us they are of less importance than the glimpse we get into the life of the freebooter. Such a band as David's—tradition makes it to have reached six hundred men—must have been driven to all sorts of shifts to keep alive. Many a sheep-master of the region must have been taxed to supply their wants. In many cases the towns must have purchased David's help against the Amalekite or his kindred. No disgrace attached to the captain who entered into such an arrangement, or who insisted upon it. He was giving as well as receiving a favour, and we know that when David ob-

¹ Carmel, Maon, and Ziph, which are mentioned in this part of David's history, are all identified in the region southeast of Hebron; compare G. A. Smith's description, *Historical Geography*, p. 306 note.

tained booty he was free-handed with it, making presents in his turn to the towns which had dealt generously with him.

It is difficult to say how much Saul added to the perplexity of the situation. Tradition makes the Ziphites so anxious to be rid of David that they invited Saul to come against him, themselves acting as spies for the army. Two separate accounts are preserved to us illustrating David's magnanimity toward his enemy. The more original seems to be the one which makes David, when Saul is on his track, steal into the king's camp at night accompanied by a single follower. The guards are all asleep; the defenceless king lies at their feet; Abishai is eager to pin him to the earth with a single thrust of the spear. But David takes seriously the divinity that doth hedge a king. Saul is to him "the Anointed of Yahweh," a consecrated person whom to harm would be sacrilege. Hence he refuses the permission desired by his attendant, and contents himself with taking objects enough to show that he has been in the camp. The succeeding revulsion of feeling on the part of Saul is just what we might expect; and on the other hand it is not strange that David should distrust his enemy's good-will and decline to put himself in his power. The account possesses verisimilitude, therefore, and it presents David in the light in which he was viewed by his contemporaries.¹

Tired of the precarious struggle in the wilderness, David at length resolved on the only course open to him. He could enlist under the banner of a more powerful chief, one with resources enough to insure him support, and with territory enough to give him employment. Such a chief he found in Achish, king of Gath. The location of Gath is as yet unknown to us, but we gather that its territory was exposed to the raids of the Bedawin, and that only a soldier who had experience in border warfare could hold them in check. Achish at first planned to make David captain of his body-guard, and to keep him at the capital. But the arrangement proved impracticable. The Israelites of David's command would hardly be conciliatory to the Philistines among whom they were settled. David himself

¹ The account is contained in 1 Sam. 26. The parallel, chapter 24, is a much less probable narrative. The difficulty in receiving either as strictly historical arises from the improbability of Saul's being so far away from his own domain in chase of a fugitive band which was doing him no harm.

had fought against Philistines in the old days, and there were probably blood feuds to be settled. Furthermore, it was not to David's taste to be always under the king's eye. He had been his own master too long to become a courtier again. Moved by these considerations, he proposed that he should receive one of the outlying places—town and fortress—where he could more easily reach the border ruffians.

In this way he became Emir of Ziklag, a town in the edge of the desert, and here his men, with wives and children, made their abode. To a late date the kings of Judah traced their title to the town to the gift of Achish, and we may therefore suppose the place to have been an enclave in Philistine territory. Here David acted the part of a robber chief. He and his men were constantly raiding the neighbouring nomads, carrying off their cattle, and putting the people to the sword. Achish received part of the booty, and heard with pleasure that David was carrying the war into the borders of Judah and its affiliated clans.¹ The estrangement between David and his own people thus seemed to be complete, and his devotion to his new master was regarded as established. So great was the king's confidence, that, as we have seen, he called David to follow him in the great Philistine campaign against northern Israel. The embarrassing situation was happily relieved by the suspicion of the Philistine leaders.

Two can play at the game of war, and fortune cannot be expected always to favour the same side. The Amalekites had reason to seek revenge.² Discovering the unprotected state of Ziklag when David and his men were called to the war, they attacked the town and gained possession of it. The houses were burned, and everything of value was carried off, including the women and children, whom the captors no doubt expected to

¹ David himself is represented (1 Sam. 27¹⁰) as saying that he had raided the Negeb of Judah, the Negeb of the Jerachmeelites, and the Negeb of the Kenites. The Kenites are known to have been allies of Israel from the time of Moses. Jerachmeel was later absorbed in Judah. Both clans are named among those who received presents from David, 1 Sam. 30²⁶⁻³¹. The proper home of Judah seems to have been Bethlehem, while Hebron was the seat of Caleb. Only by bearing these facts in mind do we get a correct idea of the disintegration of the country.

² This desert clan had been in feud with Israel ever since the exodus. Their appearance in this narrative is proof enough that they had not been exterminated by Saul, as is affirmed by 1 Sam. 15.

sell in the Egyptian market as slaves. The prompt pursuit by David, the good fortune that threw into his hands a slave-boy able to guide him to the camp of the plunderers, the successful attack—all are graphically set forth in the Biblical narrative. A good impression of David's executive ability is given by the promptness of his pursuit, and by the decision with which he settled the quarrel among his men about the booty. His own share of the spoil he used to win the hearts of the Sheikhs in Judah and the allied clans—reminding us of Mohammed's policy after the battle of Honein.¹

The imagination of later times was pleased to bring David news of the death of Saul by the mouth of an Amalekite, whose hands also bore the royal crown and bracelet. The obvious impossibility of his story compels us to reject it. Probably no one at this time thought of David as Saul's successor. In his own mind there may have been hope of something of the kind. The duty at hand was to strengthen himself in his own region of Judah. Here, the advantages of having a strong man as their ally had been brought home to the Sheikhs by David's presents, as well as by his protection. The career of Saul had familiarised the people with the idea of a monarchy. No opposition on the part of the Philistines was to be feared, for David was their tributary, and their power had just been firmly established by the victory at Gilboa. The more complete organisation of Judah would (as it seemed to them) put more power into their hands. They could hardly imagine David succeeding where Saul had failed. We can understand their looking on with indifference, if not with encouragement, while he negotiated with the clans.

The most important city in the region was Hebron, the capital of Caleb, or possibly of an alliance of clans afterward merged in Judah. Hither came David with his trusty soldiers, and was recognised as king by the Sheikhs.² No doubt he secured the

¹ The reader may supplement the account of this part of David's life by such other sections of the Biblical text as commend themselves to his judgment. With the adventures in the Wilderness of Judah, and the migration to Gath, there seems to be no room for those at the stronghold of Adullam, 1 Sam. 22^{1, 2}, 23. We must suppose these displaced in the compilation.

² It is perhaps not too bold to see in the name of the city (*Confederacy*) a reminiscence of its composite population. The name Kirjath-arba (*City of Four*), might be traced to the same origin; but this name occurs only in very late documents, and any argument from it is precarious.

citadel, or built one, where his retainers could maintain him, should the popular sentiment undergo a change. From Hebron he could easily extend his sway over the Edomite clans on the south and over Judah, which lay between him and Jerusalem. If he was himself a Judahite, his own clan would in fact cling to him among the first. The whole region had suffered the ills of tribal society where every clan is against every other. The king's peace is to such a people more than an empty name. The whole period on which we look back—from the El Amarna time down—had been conspicuously lacking in peace; there was no king in Israel, and every man did that which was right in his own eyes. A king promised a stable government. If he or his body-guard were guilty of occasional acts of oppression, the mass of the people would yet be better off than where they had no protector. The king must keep external invasion from the boundaries, and he must repress private warfare within his domain. Some such thoughts as these passed through the minds of the burghers of Hebron as they welcomed David and anointed him at their sanctuary. King of Caleb and Judah was what he aspired to be. But he aspired to a nominal headship over other parts of Israel—so we conclude from his message of gratitude to the men of Jabesh Gilead. It would be something for them in their disorganised condition to feel that there was the tie of blood between them and the able and energetic king of Hebron.

Lack of a chronology in our sources embarrasses us in attempting to follow the history at this point. Did David proceed at once to bring Benjamin under his rule? Against this¹ may be urged the position of Jerusalem, as yet unsubdued, and the difficulty which David would experience in carrying on a war so far from his base of supplies. Obtuse as the Philistines were—or self-confident if one chooses—they would surely take the alarm by the time David had consolidated his power over the country south of Jerusalem. We may conjecture, then, that the Philistines did take the alarm before the conquest of Jerusalem or of Benjamin. They made Bethlehem their objective point in one campaign as we know. At another time they attacked Keilah, a

¹ Which seems to be the theory of the Biblical writer, 2 Sam. 2-4, where, following immediately on the anointing at Hebron, we find the war with Abner. Compare the article of S. A. Cook: "Notes on the Composition of Second Samuel," in the *Am. Jour. Sem. Lang.*, XVI., pp. 145-177.

border town of Judah. David was obliged to take refuge in the fortress of Adullam. From this stronghold he was able to hang upon the flanks of the enemy and finally to compel them to retreat. The relief of Keilah was one of his feats. The killing of Goliath in a duel by one of his followers probably belongs in the same connexion.¹ Other exploits may belong with this—the most pleasing is the one where three of David's men break through the lines of the Philistines to bring him a drink of water from Bethlehem.²

By what finesse David lulled his foes into security till he could strike the decisive blow we are not told. The time came when he could strike such a blow. In fact, two capital engagements are recorded, one at Baal Perazim, where the Philistine idols, which they had brought into the battle with them, fell into the hands of Israel; the other at Bekaim, where an omen of Yahweh's presence was taken from the "sound of marching in the tops of the Balsams"—doubtless sacred trees in which the God was thought to reside. The result of the campaign seems to have been deliverance from the Philistine overlordship.³

¹ In Arab warfare it is very common for a warrior to advance from the ranks and challenge anyone from the opposing army to meet him in single combat. The early history of Islam furnishes several instances.

² The reason for putting these exploits here is that Adullam must have been David's headquarters in his Philistine war. The duel with Goliath (which in the form in which it has come down to us in 1 Sam. is legendary—the earliest account is 2 Sam. 21¹⁹) is located in the immediate vicinity of Adullam—the valley of Elah, 1 Sam. 17². Keilah was in the same region.

³ Our text puts the break with the Philistines after the capture of Jerusalem. But it is incomprehensible that David should leave his fortress at Jerusalem to go down to Adullam. The account of the capture of Jerusalem obviously disturbs the connexion of the passage in which it is now found. The valley of Rephaim is perhaps named from the gigantic Philistines (sons of the *rapha*) who were overcome there. The indication of 2 Sam. 23¹³, is that it was between Adullam and Bethlehem, and nearer the former place. The current identification with the plain that stretches southwestward from Jerusalem can hardly be correct. Oracles from sacred trees are well known in other religions. The rustling of the sacred oak at Dodona was regarded as the voice of Zeus; Frazer, *The Golden Bough*², III, p. 346; Evans, "Tree and Pillar Cult," in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, XXI, p. 106. Semitic analogies are given by W. R. Smith, *Religion of the Semites*, pp. 126, 169, 178. The latter author finds such trees in Gen. 12⁶, Judg. 9³⁷, cf. Deut. 11³⁰. Egyptian analogies are also found, Wiedemann, *Religion of the Ancient Egyptians*, p. 155.

The Philistine campaign or campaigns probably opened the king's eyes to the advantages of the Canaanite city of Jerusalem. The settlement at this location must have been one of the earliest in Southern Palestine, for it is a stronghold by nature. Two rocky ridges with a shallow valley between them were on three sides so precipitous that they scarcely needed the art of man to make them impregnable. A living fountain at the base of the eastern ridge fixed the location of the first houses. As time went on the inhabitants added to their natural fortifications a wall, which the Israelites had not been able at any time to scale. So great was the confidence of the people in the place, that even against David's veterans they manned the wall with their lame and blind, believing these to be sufficient defenders. Whether there may not have been some Israelites settled as clients in the lower town before the time of David is a question easier to raise than to answer. The fact that, though captured by Judah, the city was always counted to Benjamin might argue for the affirmative.¹

The over-confidence of the garrison was its ruin. David's seasoned soldiers took the place by storm. His clemency is seen in the fact that Araunah, a Jebusite, was in peaceable possession of his landed property at a later time. Very possibly David did not at once take up his residence in the newly conquered city. It would be of use to him as a frontier fortress, and then as a basis from which to undertake the conquest of Benjamin, while he retained his residence at Hebron.²

As we have seen, Ishbaal, a son of Saul, had been proclaimed king by Abner, his cousin, the commander of Saul's army. Abner seems to have been a man of energy and ability. What arrangement he made with the Philistines we do not know, but some shadow of power must have been left to Ishbaal, even over Benjamin. To avoid the humiliation of witnessing Philistine tax-gatherers or garrisons in his court, we can hardly wonder that

¹ The name Jebus seems to be an erroneous deduction from the clan name of the inhabitants—the Jebusites. The name Jerusalem is older than the Israelite invasion.

² The literature on the topography and history of Jerusalem is enormous. The articles in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible* and in the *Encyclopædia Biblica* may be consulted. There seems to be substantial unanimity in the view that the original city of the Jebusites and of David was on the eastern ridge.

Ishbaal¹ preferred to fix his capital across the Jordan, where a loyal Israelite population was still found. Of course, he claimed jurisdiction over all that had belonged to his father. The Hebrew writer enumerates Gilead, Asher, Jezreel, Ephraim, and Benjamin as making up his kingdom. It is difficult to suppose that his power was more than nominal over Asher and Jezreel.

Whatever piety David may have felt toward Saul, he had no scruples about making war upon his successor.² The success against the Philistines and the possession of Jerusalem stimulated his ambition to unite all Israel in a single kingdom, of which he should be the head. The plan was statesmanlike, even if moved by personal ambition. The union of Israel was essential if the people were to have a future, and true union could come only in a monarchy. Ishbaal was not man enough either to unite the people in loyalty to himself or to throw off the Philistine yoke. David was in the full consciousness of his own powers, ambitious to exercise those powers against the enemies of Yahweh. The first thing was to consolidate the tribes. Ishbaal stood in the way. Saul had been respected as king by the grace of God, but a king by the grace of Abner had no such claims.

The offensive was taken by David, as we may judge on finding the only battle recorded for us taking place on Benjamite ground, near Gibeon. The force employed on David's side was the band of seasoned soldiers which had accompanied him in his exile and now had become his standing army. They were under command of Joab, David's nephew, whose courage at the taking of Jerusalem had given him promotion to the generalship of the army. We must judge the foray into Benjamin like an Arab Emir's raid upon his neighbours—he can thereby keep his troops busy, secure booty, perhaps harry another clan into asking his alliance. The defence in this case was in the hands of Abner, who is represented as having *the servants of Ishbaal* under his command. The phrase would imply enlisted soldiers. But they could hardly have been the veterans of Saul's army, for these had perished with their master at Gilboa.

¹ I assume that Ishbaal was the original form of the name, which has been corrupted by the scribes to Ishbosheth (*Man of Shame*). Other theories have been advanced, but seem precarious.

² It is perhaps significant that in speaking of the death of Ishbaal, David does not use the title *Anointed of Yahweh*.

As the account has come down to us¹ the two parties are seen at the great reservoir near Gibeon. As they face each other Abner proposes that the matter be settled by a tournament of a few picked men—duels before the main engagement are not uncommon in oriental warfare, as we have already noted. Joab consents, twelve men are chosen on each side, and the two companies meet in sight of the armies. The result is indecisive—the champions fall dead together, with no survivor to claim the victory on either side.² A general engagement follows, in which Abner and his men are put to flight. The only incident which is preserved to us is the death of Asahel at the hand of Abner. Though done in self-defence and in open battle, this becomes a reason for blood-revenge on the part of Joab, Asahel's brother. How the revenge is taken we learn later. For the present we are allowed to infer that Abner and his party would have been completely exterminated had not the leader called for quarter. His plea is based on the unity of blood in Israel and Judah. The appeal is heeded by Joab, who calls off his men and returns to Hebron.

We must suppose that the battle is only one out of a number that were fought before the final surrender of Israel to David. That the process extended over a considerable time, is directly stated by the historian, who adds that the house of Saul grew weaker and weaker, while David was growing stronger and stronger. Nothing succeeds like success, and we cannot wonder that the conviction made its way in Israel that David was the man for the hour. The course of events was hastened by a quarrel between Ishbaal and his supporter. The woman in the case was a concubine of Saul, named Rizpah. According to ancient Semitic custom, a man's wives are a part of his estate, and go to his heirs on his death.³ Abner took possession of Rizpah in defiance of the right of Ishbaal. The act could be interpreted only as a trespass; it was therefore an open declaration that the Major Domo knew himself to be strong enough to disregard common

¹ It is possible that two events have become confused by the tradition, for the narrative as it stands does not read smoothly.

² The Roman legend of the Horatii and Curiatii is compared with this by Winckler, *Gesch. Israels*, II, p. 194 f.

³ The evidence is given by W. R. Smith, *Kinship and Marriage*, pp. 86-91.

opinion and the claim of his master. Weak men are proverbially jealous of prerogative, and least willing to recognise the fact of their own weakness. Ishbaal called Abner to account, but the only reply he got was a taunt, and a declaration of revolt. To this he had nothing to reply. The fact seems to be that Abner was getting tired of a losing struggle. He was seeking a pretext to go over to David. His influence in Benjamin was considerable—perhaps it was worth something with the Sheikhs of the other tribes. He could at least negotiate with David and secure his own future.

Hence his message to David, which contained a round promise to bring all Israel over to him in case terms could be agreed upon. David insisted, as a preliminary, that Saul's daughter Michal, the wife of his youth, should be returned to him—she had been married to another soon after David's flight from Gibeah. Was David moved by sentiment? Had he cherished the memory of her affection through all these years? Or, was he simply anxious to wipe out the disgrace that attached to him in another man's possessing what he had a claim to? Or, was he only politic—did he think his possession of Saul's daughter would strengthen his position as Saul's successor? We are entirely in the dark in the endeavour to answer these questions. The demand was made, and Abner hastened to accede to it. Formally it was made to Ishbaal, the execution was intrusted to Abner. Possibly the affair was purposely planned in such a way as to give Abner a good pretext for visiting David. The distress of the woman's husband is vividly set before us. What her own feelings were, we are not told; but we can readily see that her introduction to the court of Hebron could not have been very happy. Her harsh words to David at the time of the bringing up of the Ark, were probably the breaking out of long pent-up feelings.¹

The arrangement between David and Abner was easily made. The king knew the value of the man with whom he was dealing. A feast was held to ratify the compact between them.² Abner

¹ 2 Sam. 3⁶⁻³⁹ contains the account of Abner's trespass, his treason, and his death. The narrative is not free from difficulties, but there seems no reason to question its main statements.

² A sacrificial feast is what we expect on such an occasion, but probably all feasts were sacrificial in this period.

agreed to use his influence with the Sheikhs in favour of David. The king, on his part, must have agreed to reward Abner with a high place at court. Perhaps he already felt the inconvenience of having too powerful a servant, such as we know Joab to have been; in which case he was hoping to use Abner as a counterpoise. One thing, however, must have been discussed. Abner was in blood-feud with Joab on account of the death of Asahel. There must have been some pledge of security on the part of the king, an assurance that the king's peace was stronger than tribal claims, and that the king's peace would be made effective in his favour. It would imply gross carelessness to leave this point untouched in the negotiations.

Whatever assurances passed between the parties on this point, they reckoned without their host. Joab had been sent with his troops on an expedition, so that Abner's visit might be made without disturbance. Returning soon after Abner had taken his departure, he learned what had occurred. It could not be pleasing to him to have at court a possible rival and a certain enemy. Whether he fathomed David's inner purpose or not, he needed no concurrent motive to seek Abner's blood—the most sacred duty of a clansman rested upon him; for blood-revenge makes its demand most stringently on the nearest kin, and one's own brother is nearest of all. The severest regulations of Mohammed, enforced by the sanctions of religion, failed in some instances to control his followers in this matter, and we cannot wonder that David, a recently elected monarch, should fail to make the king's peace binding in the face of natural impulse reinforced by tribal morality. Joab was impetuous and unscrupulous. His expostulation with David showed the freedom which he enjoyed at court. He doubtless felt that David, himself a kinsman, was unfaithful to his blood in giving Abner a safe-conduct. The safe-conduct did not avail with him. Sending for Abner on the pretext that some matters of detail were yet to be arranged, he took him aside in the city gate. His brother Abishai kept off any meddlers, and Joab took his revenge by stabbing Abner to the heart. The only thing strange in the matter is the security which Abner seems to have felt. Perhaps he was intoxicated with the prospect of the new honours he was about to receive at the hand of David.

David was innocent in the matter, and his indignation at the

violation of the king's peace showed itself in the violence of his language. In strong objurcation he wished upon Joab's descendants filthy diseases, physical weakness, effeminacy, and poverty. But he did not venture to punish the offender. He could not get along without Joab. Doubtless his conscience was somewhat divided against itself. Tribal morality was still strong, and the common sense of the people would uphold Joab. To set up a new code might even endanger the throne. To purge himself from the suspicion of having been an accomplice, however, the king himself followed the bier of the slain man and composed a dirge for the occasion: ¹

"Should Abner die as dies the fool?
Thy hands were not bound,
Thy feet not brought into fetters!
As one falls before ruthless men thou didst fall."

The death of Abner threw the kingdom of Ishbaal into confusion, for the incompetency of the king became manifest. Two soldiers of fortune, enlisted in his service, thought to make their personal profit out of the situation by the assassination of the unfortunate monarch. It is possible that they had other reasons for the deed.² Their reception by David when they appeared at Hebron was different from their anticipation. The king's sense of justice conspired with his interest to discourage assassination, and the self-confessed criminals were executed on the spot.³ Their hands and feet, as the guilty instruments of the crime and

¹ The reader will notice the closeness with which this account has followed the Biblical text. The greater part of 2 Sam. comes from an old and well-informed source, which, however, is not as homogeneous as has sometimes been assumed. In the section just reproduced (2⁸-3³⁹) there are some unevennesses due to interpolation. The most disturbing is 3¹⁷⁻¹⁹, which represents Abner as having made considerable effort to promote David's cause before he went to Hebron. This seems improbable, and, besides, the paragraph interrupts the thread of the story.

² The obscure notice 2 Sam. 4^{2f} seems designed to explain that the assassins were not full-blooded Benjamites, but clients. It has been conjectured that the Beerothites were among the Gibeonites attacked by Saul, in which case these men had revenge to take.

³ Winckler supposes the statement legendary, influenced by the story of the Amalekite in 2 Sam. 1. I should prefer to consider this the original. An exact historical parallel from the life of Ahmed Ibn Tulûn is given by Stähelin, *Leben Davids* (1866), p. 28.

the escape, were exposed to view in a public place. The head of Ishbaal, on the other hand, was carefully buried in the grave of Abner, his kinsman. The conduct of David toward the house of Saul gives no occasion for adverse criticism.

At the same time, the new kingdom could not fail to benefit by the death of Ishbaal. The party of Saul was left without a competent head. Jonathan's only son was a cripple. The sons of Rizpah, of whom we hear later, were of inferior blood on the mother's side. The sons of Merab were reckoned to their father's tribe. No doubt the temper of Benjamin was such that any near relative of Saul who had the qualities of leadership could have rallied the tribe to his support. But such a man did not appear. If Israel were to be united—and the course of events made this increasingly necessary—David was the only possibility. Hence the Sheikhs, no doubt after long debate among themselves, came to him and recognised him as king. The process probably went on gradually for a number of years. The step was often taken reluctantly, sometimes under compulsion, sometimes hastened by concessions on David's part. It is a loss to history that we have not the details, and also that there has come down to us no copy of the "covenant" which was entered into.¹ The existence of such an agreement (whether oral or written makes no special difference) shows that the king was not regarded as an absolute monarch. The Sheikhs made some effort to protect the liberties of the tribes. Moreover, they did not regard the recognition of the monarch as a pledge to continue his dynasty on the throne. The renewal of the constitution (if this be not too large a word) was expected at each new coronation. The parallel in the early Caliphate, where the monarch was elected by the suffrages of the Moslems, will occur to everyone.

The Hebrew historian's lack of interest in what we should call political or constitutional history, leaves us in the dark concerning the measures that David took to unify his kingdom. Some such measures he must have taken. Israel was a congeries of clans, only feebly conscious of their common blood. Some of them were largely made up of Canaanite elements. Their jeal-

¹ The compact was made in Hebron "before Yahweh" (2 Sam. 5³), and had been preceded by a covenant with Abner, perhaps as representative of the tribes, 3^{12, 13, 21}; though we must not lose sight of the possibility that the passages belong to different documents.

ousies of each other were notorious. Ephraim had never taken kindly to the leadership of any other tribe; Benjamin was only half won over to the new king; the wars between David and Ishbaal must have left many a feud unsettled. It was probably in view of the unsettled state of affairs that David removed his capital to Jerusalem. The location was excellent—a fortress that could easily be made impregnable, midway between Hebron, the capital of the south, and Shechem, the capital of Ephraim, without historic associations that could arouse the jealousy of any tribe, on the border of Benjamin, where he could keep an eye on that unruly tribe. The command of the highway from north to south was also important; less so the command of the road from Joppa to Jericho. It was a stroke of genius when David strengthened the citadel and removed his residence thither. The history of the city since his time has justified his choice. Even after the northern tribes had revolted from the house of David, no king ever thought of returning to Hebron.

The choice of Jerusalem, then, is one of the steps taken to consolidate the kingdom. We are tempted to put alongside of it the removal of the Ark to the new capital.¹ But in doing this we should be importing into the transaction the ideas of a later time. It must be remembered that David had no idea of making a single central sanctuary for the whole country. In his time the land was full of sanctuaries. They were on every high hill and under every green tree, as a later prophet informs us, and up to this time no one had any idea that they were not all legitimate places of worship for all Israel. What David had in mind was to secure for his own residence—in fact for his own chapel—the ancient palladium of Israel. It was probably not the only sacred object that would grace the new place of worship. Abiathar, who had carried the ephod in the wilderness campaigns, was priest of the royal house, and naturally we suppose that he brought his ephod with him. But the Ark had been connected with the worship of Ephraim and Benjamin. Though it had remained in comparative obscurity since the time when the Philistines had returned it to its own territory, it was still venerable from its antiquity, and might be made to contribute to the reconciliation of the northern tribes. Doubtless, also, David was moved by a desire to have in his citadel such a pledge of the

¹ 2 Sam. 6 1-19.

presence of Yahweh. Its ancient reputation as a leader in battle was known to him, and we find him sending it on some of his campaigns later. Piety and worldly interest seem to have combined to recommend the removal.

David and his men therefore went to Baal Judah to bring up the Ark. The two sons of its guardian accompanied it, and, after the manner of the Philistines, it was carried on a cart which had never been profaned by any other work.¹ David and a select choir of musicians joined in songs of religious exaltation before it. But the joy was marred by an untoward accident. The procession had already reached Jerusalem, and was climbing up the ascent to the citadel, when the oxen slipped in the miry street. The cart shook and the Ark seemed about to fall, when Uzzah, who was walking by its side, put out his hand to steady it. By what the spectators interpreted as an act of God, the rash man fell dead on the spot. We can hardly wonder that David was angry when he saw his care repaid by such an outbreak, or that he feared to have so incomprehensible a God near him. The nearest house at the time of the accident belonged to Obed-edom, one of David's Philistine mercenaries. Hither the sacred and dangerous object was brought, and here it was left, the aim of the day's work being unattained.

Such is the story we find in our record, and, in spite of some difficulties,² there seems to be no reason why we should not accept it as substantially correct. The anger of Yahweh was indeed unaccountable, for there is no evidence that Uzzah violated any regulation or tradition then in existence. But unaccounta-

¹ Stähelin, *Leben Davids*, p. 39 speaks of sacred wagons among the Phœnicians (Carthaginians), but I am not able to verify the reference or to confirm the statement from other sources.

² The opening statement (2 Sam. 6¹), seems to be part of another narrative; it is difficult to suppose that Kirjath-jearim, at which we left the Ark in the time of Samuel, is the same as Baal Judah, which seems to be the place where David finds it. For these reasons, and others, Cheyne (article "Ark" in the *Enc. Bib.*) thinks it more probable that David captured the Ark from the Philistines, bringing it from the house of Obed-edom in Gath. But it seems to me impossible to suppose that a Hebrew author of a later time would have enrolled Obed-edom, a Gittite, among David's men, and made him reside in Jerusalem, unless he were compelled by the facts so to do. The death of Uzzah is indeed mysterious, but not entirely inexplicable. In the views then held of the sacredness of the Ark, the man's own terror at his rash act is enough to account for the stroke that came upon him.

bility was then attributed to the God of Israel. What He did here was only in line with what the people had observed elsewhere. The prophets had not yet arisen to teach that the divine acts were not arbitrary but were motivated by righteousness.

After three months' experiment, it became evident that Yahweh's anger was to have no further ill-effects. The prosperity of Obededom and his household became the subject of common remark. David was not minded to lose such advantages, and he resolved to bring the giver home to himself. This time, to avoid further accident, the Ark was carried up the hill on men's shoulders. The solemn procession was again formed, with the king at its head. As soon as it became evident that Yahweh was disposed to go, a sacrifice was offered.¹ With shoutings and trumpeting the train entered the fortress, the king in advance whirling and leaping in the sacred dance, clothed in the primitive garment usually worn by the ministers of the sanctuary. Yahweh was introduced into the tent prepared for Him, lavish sacrifices were offered, and provisions for a feast were distributed to the people.

Thus was consecrated a spot destined to become famous in the world's history. The Ark was connected by tradition with Israel's past; it now became the central object of the royal sanctuary. That sanctuary became the site of Solomon's Temple, and the Ark continued its chief and central *sacrum*. To a later time it continued to be the unique symbol of the divine presence, and the pledge of the covenant between Yahweh and His people. Little of this was in David's thought; he builded wiser than he knew.²

The author of our account gives us a glimpse into the harem as a supplement to his story.³ Michal, Saul's daughter, had no understanding of her husband's religious fervour, though it was not unlike what she must have witnessed in her own father. Watching the procession from her lattice, she marked only the

¹ Doubtless by the king's own hand. We know that Saul offered sacrifice, and in the sacred character conferred by anointing, the king would find his right to act as priest. Later times drew the line more strictly. Assyrian parallels are given by McCurdy, *History, Prophecy, and the Monuments*, I, p. 64. The story of Melchizedek shows how easily even a late writer joins the offices of priest and king.

² To the account we have been considering a late writer has appended a Messianic promise, introduced by a statement of David's desire to build a permanent temple, 2 Sam. 7.

³ 2 Sam. 6²⁰⁻²⁶.

violation of conventional decency as the king, lightly clothed, leaped and whirled before the Ark. Her sarcastic greeting as he came into the house was perhaps the expression of something more than momentary feeling. The king's reply, with its reminder of her father's dynasty and its fall, was not calculated to restore good feeling. The permanent estrangement that resulted was only too natural.

As has already been intimated, we would readily spare some of the family history in which our authors are interested, if only we could have a clearer view of political events. All that we learn about David's foreign policy is, that after his defeat of the Philistines he turned his arms against the people beyond the Jordan. First attacking Moab he treated them with great severity. Two-thirds of the males are said to have been put to the sword. For this cruelty some special provocation has been looked for—treachery against David's family has been suggested for one thing.¹ But it is doubtful whether any hypothesis of the kind is necessary. The Old Testament gives evidence enough of the bloody character of the wars carried on in those days. If we may trust a later writer,² Edom was even more severely treated. What was left of these tribes was made tributary, and there seems to have been no attempt to embody them in the kingdom in the sense in which the tribes of Israel were embodied in it. The case of the Ammonites was different. They gave special provocation, and those of them who survived the war were put at hard labour. Their allies in the region of Lebanon were compelled to pay tribute.³ Thus David became king over a respectable territory, but one in which the heterogeneous elements were likely to fall apart when the controlling hand of the monarch loosened its grasp. The greetings of Toi, king of Hamath, and

¹ The enigmatical insertion in 1 Sam. 22, to the effect that David intrusted his father and mother to the care of the King of Moab gives no basis for the suggestion.

² 1 Kings, 11¹⁵, where we are told that Joab slew all the males. Winckler supposes with some probability that in the first campaign Israel had been defeated, and that the severity of Joab was exercised in revenge, *Alttest. Untersuchungen*, p. 4.

³ 2 Sam. 10¹⁻¹¹, 12²⁶⁻³¹. From a later passage we learn that Shobi ben Nahash gave David substantial aid and comfort during the revolt of Absalom (*ibid.*, 17²⁷⁻²⁹). It does not seem presumptuous to suppose that David had made him governor of Ammon after the defeat and execution of his brother Hanun.

perhaps of the king of Tyre welcomed him into the circle of monarchs. According to the Hebrew writer, Toi sent him presents, and the king of Tyre offered him artificers, Phœnicia being far in advance of Israel in the mechanic arts.

The court was organised on a more extensive scale than in the kingdom of Saul. David himself was, of course, the chief justice, and was accessible to all his people. The case of the wise woman of Tekoah is enough to show this, and Absalom's insinuation of lack of due attention on the king's part to cases of wrong must be taken as the demagogue's perversion of the truth in his own interest. We hear now, for the first time, of an officer whose business it was to keep track of public affairs—a monitor for the king. Perhaps the Wezir of the Caliphate would fairly represent him. Two chief military officers are named—Joab over the army, and Benaiah over the Cherethites and Pelethites. We can understand this only by assuming that Joab was the commander-in-chief, who led the whole effective force of the nation when it was called out, while Benaiah was the second in command. The Cherethites and Pelethites were the body-guard, a band of mercenaries recruited, as the name indicates, among foreigners, chiefly Philistines. The nucleus of the force was David's band of followers in the wilderness. A picked force of thirty men was distinguished by a separate organisation under their own commander. We hear also of a scribe, apparently the king's private secretary, and two priests are now counted among the court officers. One of these was Abiathar, the survivor of Saul's massacre at Nob, who had carried the ephod during the wilderness sojourn. The other, Zadok, was promoted for reasons unknown to us. The royal chapel seems to have had other functionaries, among whom David's sons were enrolled. Now, for the first time, we hear of an overseer of the forced labour, showing the way in which the king construed his prerogative. There was also a council whose members were called Friends of the King. They were entertained regularly at the royal table.¹

As we should expect in an oriental monarch, when David's power and wealth increased, he increased also his harem.² In

¹ The list of officers given in 2 Sam. 20²³⁻²⁶ and less fully in 8¹⁵⁻¹⁸ may readily be supplemented from other parts of the narrative.

² Mohammed again furnishes a parallel, both in the increase of his establishment and in the sudden passion which seized him for his neighbour's wife.

comparison with Solomon his establishment was modest enough. Six wives are known to us by name before the removal to Jerusalem, not including Michal. At Jerusalem he added considerably to the number. It is not improbable that he entered into alliance with neighbouring monarchs by marriage, but our sources record only one instance—Absalom's mother was a princess of Geshur—probably a Philistine district.¹ Rabbinical ingenuity counts eighteen wives and concubines in David's establishment, but the ten concubines left by David when he fled from Absalom can hardly have been so large a proportion of the whole number—more than one-half.

The story of David's adultery is so familiar, that the historian may excuse himself from repeating it.² In its present form, the account has been worked over by a comparatively late hand, but there seems to be no reason to doubt the accuracy of its main features—the adultery, the attempt at concealment, the murder of Uriah. Similar incidents are common enough in the lives of absolute monarchs. The peculiarity of this one is the fidelity with which the moral sense of the community asserted itself in the rebuke by the prophet.

Next to sensual indulgence, parental fondness for sons has been the temptation of oriental rulers. In this, also, David was the child of his own times, and of his own people. His sons grew up without the wholesome restraints which are needed in a court, though so difficult there to impose. The eldest gave way to his mad passion for his half-sister Tamar. Her brother Absalom avenged the outrage by killing the perpetrator. His banishment from the court was ended at the intercession of Joab, but his high temper is seen in his treatment of his benefactor. Not willing to wait for the throne until his father should be taken away in the course of nature, he stirred up the disaffection which he saw smouldering in Judah. The demagogic arts with which he seduced the people from their allegiance are vividly described.³ No doubt there was wide-spread disaffection. Judah was angry

¹ The Aramaic Geshur was too remote for David's alliance in his early career. It should be noted that one author makes David the possessor of Saul's harem, 2 Sam. 12⁸.

² 2 Sam. 11²–12²⁵.

³ 2 Sam. 15¹⁻⁶. Absalom's personal charm is evident. The statement about his hair is possibly intended to tell us that he was also a religious devotee—in which character he would add to his influence over men.

because the capital had been taken away from Hebron. Benjamin had little reason to love its conqueror. In the other tribes the new order of things could not fail to make some enemies. The temper of a considerable part of the people is indicated in oriental fashion by the conduct of Shimei.¹

The extent of the disaffection was known to David, for he left his capital and retreated to Mahanaim, the stronghold of ancient Israelite loyalty. With him there went only his mercenaries, now apparently two companies—veteran Cherethites and Pelethites, and a new band under Ittai the Gittite. Outside the king's own household none of the inhabitants of Jerusalem showed their loyalty by offering to fight for him. In fact, the whole country was aflame. Shimei would not have dared to show his hatred had he not been sure that Benjamin at least was of his way of thinking. The rebellion of the Bichrites under Sheba, their Sheikh, was only a part of the general revolt.² When it became clear that Absalom was no improvement over David, the people gradually took sides. In the final battle David's forces included a considerable body of militia. But even here it is plain that his mercenaries turned the scale. The reduction of Abel in the extreme north of the country (near Dan) was the last act of an extended drama. The fierce quarrel which took place when David returned to his capital gives a vivid picture of the feeling between Israel and Judah, and we cannot say that David was free from bias in the way he treated it.

It is hopeless to attempt restoration of the chronological order so plainly violated by our narratives. The two great calamities of David's reign are recounted for us in an appendix to the main history, and we must be content to take them in the same order. They are too characteristic of the times to be passed over. The first of these was one of the famines of which we hear in Palestine from the earliest times. When the visitation came, David inquired of the oracle for the cause of Yahweh's wrath, and received the reply that blood rested on the house of Saul for his slaughter of the Gibeonites. The Gibeonites, as we have already

¹ 2 Sam. 16⁵⁻¹⁵. The abject submission of the rebel at David's return (19¹⁹) deprives him of the little sympathy we might give him as a kinsman of Saul.

² Our sources present the revolt of Sheba as a sort of postlude to Absalom's usurpation. But it would have been madness to revolt after the suppression of Absalom.

seen, were Canaanites who had entered into alliance with Israel. Such alliances were the rule rather than the exception in the time preceding the monarchy. Saul, within whose territory the Gibeonites were located, was moved by the same sort of zeal for a purely Israelite nationality which later found such extreme expression in the book of Deuteronomy. He was minded, therefore, to disregard the solemn sanctions by which Israel was bound, and took steps to exterminate the Canaanitish section of the people. This was the more indefensible in that the people of Gibeon had Yahweh as their Baal.

The interpretation put upon the famine was that Saul's disregard of the ancestral oath had brought guilt upon Israel. The blood could be wiped out only by blood. Who should suffer if not the descendants of the guilty man? The Gibeonites show by their language that they are acting both generously and justly in demanding that seven descendants of the guilty man shall be delivered over to them to be impaled before Yahweh at their sanctuary.¹

Their demand was complied with, and the impaled bodies remained in the open air until the rains began to fall. The ghastly story is relieved by Rizpah's pathetic devotion to the children who were thus treated as malefactors, and whom she must think under the curse of God. Through the weary weeks she watched them with a mother's care. When the first rains proclaimed that Yahweh was reconciled, David showed his appreciation of her devotion by giving the bones of the unfortunates honourable burial. The fact that the incident added to the stability of his throne should not make us impugn his motives. So far as the record shows, we have no right to accuse him of instigating the execution. The consideration which he showed to Jonathan's son, Meribbaal, is inexplicable, in case he had a set purpose to exterminate the house of Saul.² Him he made a pensioner, and to him he restored the property of Saul.

¹ 2 Sam. 21 4-6. The implication is that they might have demanded victims from Israel at large.

² Meribbaal (the name has been disfigured by the scribes to Mephibosheth) might easily have been included among the execrated sons of Saul, had that been David's wish. Though himself incapable of reigning (being a cripple) his sons might have proved troublesome, and his death would have been as much a matter of state policy as the death of the others. The narrator shows evident interest in the house of Saul, 2 Sam. 9, 16 1-4, 19 24-30.

Almost more strange to us is the account of another calamity which fell upon the people. This was a plague which is said to have destroyed tens of thousands of the people. The plague itself is not unaccountable—history has many such visitations to record. But strange, indeed, is the Biblical writer's theory concerning it. He supposes it to be a punishment for a census taken by David. Modern expositors have been much put to it to reconcile such a theory with our view of the character of God. Their conjectures concerning David's pride, his plans for military display or activity or similar sinful motives are wholly without support from the text in our hands. The truth is that we have here one of the ideas common to primitive religions—that man should not inquire into those secrets which the gods prefer to keep to themselves. The number of inhabitants of a country is such a secret; hence the wrath of Yahweh at the census. The difference between this point of view and that of the priestly writer, who gives us such elaborate statistics concerning the number of the people, must be evident.

The account before us is interesting from its bearing on the history of the Temple. Its main points are that when the plague reached Jerusalem David's intercession for his people was heard; that the pledge of favour was a vision of the destroying angel standing over the threshing-floor of Araunah¹ the Jebusite. On this site, therefore, there was an altar erected because of the vision, and by later tradition this altar fixed the site of Solomon's Temple. We must distinguish between different parts of the narrative. There is nothing improbable in the supposition that David erected an altar in commemoration of the staying of the pestilence. But that the threshing-floor of Araunah was in the immediate vicinity of the palace of David, and on the highest point of what must have been the fortified hill of Jerusalem, is incredible. The site of Solomon's Temple was determined by the location of his palace. The altar erected by David must have been only one of the numerous sanctuaries of Jerusalem in this period. It is not surprising that the Temple attached to itself legends that were originally concerned with other sanctuaries.

In the last days of David's life, when his end seemed near, the

¹ The name is variously written and the original form is uncertain. Cheyne (*Enc. Bib. s. v.*) proposes to correct to Adonijah.

palace was disturbed by those intrigues with which we are too familiar in the history of oriental royal families. The succession had never been settled, and the throne would fall to that son who should be best able to maintain himself in it. To secure a following in the court was the object of the ambitious princes. Two of them became prominent in this struggle. No doubt it would have been the part of wisdom for David to designate his successor in such a way that there could be no mistake. But as the making of a will is one of the things which a man willingly postpones, so the designation of a successor is apt to be put off by a monarch. In David's inexperience it is not strange that he had neglected to look forward to what should take place after his death.¹ Though there was no law of primogeniture, it was natural for Adonijah (the oldest son living) to look upon the throne as belonging to him. He therefore began to assume royal state in proportion as his father kept in retirement. He counted among his adherents the older officers of David—Joab and Abiathar certainly could not be accused of disloyalty to David. But Bathsheba had maintained herself as favourite wife ever since she had become an inmate of the harem. Her ambition was to see her son Solomon on the throne—what mother is not ambitious for her children? Among his adherents we find the priest Zadok, the prophet Nathan, and the captain of the body-guard, Benaiah. It is only in accordance with human nature that the two priests should take opposite sides, and that the two generals should likewise be arrayed against each other.

The older of the two princes desired to make his position absolutely secure. He therefore invited all the high officials (except those whom he knew to be hostile) to a banquet at the Serpent's Stone.² The fact that he called all the men of Judah who were officers of the king makes it probable that he was trying to strengthen himself with the popular party. The narrator does not assert that any overt act was committed on this occasion; but the festival was interpreted by the conservatives as a coronation feast. Very possibly the expressions of loyalty to Adonijah

¹ Mohammed again furnishes a parallel, there having been no settlement of the question of his successor.

² A sanctuary is implied by the narrative. The location is given (1 Kings, 1⁹) as by the side of En Rogel. The latter is quite generally identified with the present *Bir Eyyûb*, in the Kedron valley, just below the junction of Hinnom.

among his friends in this harmonious assembly were warmer than strict etiquette toward David would prescribe.

Nathan, the court prophet, was the first to take the alarm. Very likely the lives of Solomon and his adherents would not have been safe had the plans of Adonijah succeeded. Bathsheba was persuaded that this was the case and at once used her influence with the king. She reminded him that he had promised the succession to Solomon—an ambitious mother was very likely to have secured such a promise for her son. That whatever promise there was had been made privately to her and had not been published to the court is plain from this narrative.

The body-guard was loyal to the old king, and it held the balance of power. By David's express command they escorted Solomon to another sacred place, Gihon,¹ just below the palace, and less than half a mile from the Serpent's Stone. Here another feast was held and Solomon was anointed king. When the party returned to the palace, Solomon was seated on the royal throne and received the congratulations of the crowd. The news, brought to Adonijah by one of his adherents, showed his company the danger in which they were placed, and they speedily took their leave of an enterprise now shown to be of doubtful success. Adonijah himself fled to the asylum of the altar and received only a conditional amnesty from the new king. His rash and impolitic request for one of David's concubines was interpreted by Solomon (not unwilling to find a pretext, we may suppose) as the assertion of a claim upon the throne. The popular prince was put out of the way, and his leading adherents were punished—Joab with death, Abiathar with deposition from the priesthood.²

Soon after the coronation of Solomon, the aged king was called away. His life had been an eventful one. Few of his years were without war or turmoil, but through all difficulties he advanced to a position higher than had been held by any man of his race. The best example of a *self-made man*, is what he has recently been called. That he prepared the way for the more showy reign of Solomon is one of the least of the things he accomplished. He may be said to have created a united Israel.

¹ Probably the present Fountain of the Virgin.

² One of the best pieces of Hebrew narrative in our possession is this of the accession of Solomon, 1 Kings, 1 and 2.

In his personal traits David presented an enigma such as we find in nearly all great men of antiquity. His attractive qualities cannot be doubted. In an age when courage was the first requisite of a soldier, he was one of the most successful soldiers. The force of his character is seen in the influence he exerted over his turbulent band of adherents. Such a leadership implies charm as well as force. He won the favour of Saul and the friendship of Jonathan; in a court that would naturally look askance at him when his monarch's jealousy was aroused, he walked so discreetly that he pleased all the people. His magnanimity is illustrated in many of the stories that have come down to us; he spared Saul when he had him in his power; he refused the water which was to him consecrated by the valour of his intrepid soldiers; he was mindful of his duty to his friend Jonathan, giving his son an honourable place at court; he repaid the kindness of Barzillai by attention to his son Chimham; not to mar the happiness of his return to Jerusalem, he spared Shimei, who had grossly insulted him.¹ In the light of these instances we can readily see how he gained and kept the affection of those nearest him.

The darker shades of the picture are not lacking, and have often given the enemies of tradition occasion to blaspheme. To estimate the man we must remember that he was an oriental, and therefore sensual, crafty, and cruel. In no one of these qualities did he fall below the standard of the times in which he lived. The case of Uriah, indeed, shocked the moral sense of his contemporaries. It is not our concern to hold him up as a pattern of all the virtues. Probably few men of his time, however, would have gone through the difficulties which he encountered and done so little to offend the conscience of a later time.²

Later times made David a saint after their own ideal, a nursing

¹Our account makes David charge Solomon to do what he himself had sworn not to do, by putting Shimei out of the way. The present tendency among scholars is to discredit this story, as also the injunction to put Joab to death. It is argued that a defender of Solomon wished to relieve him from the odium of these murders. I think it doubtful whether Solomon's friends would have felt the need of defending him for acts entirely within his competency as ruler; and, on the other hand, I think it extremely probable that David had a vivid recollection of the way in which he had been treated by both Joab and Shimei.

²On the character of David the reader will be interested to consult Cheyne, *Aids to the Devout Study of Criticism* (1892), Chapter II.

father of the Old Testament Church, an organiser of the Levitical system, and the author of the Psalter. It is this picture of David which has made the most difficulty for modern apologists, and which is impossible to reconcile with the one we have just considered. David's piety was real, but it was in accordance with the standard of his own times. He adorned his private chapel with the most sacred object within his reach. He doubtless found peace and joy in the thought of Yahweh's presence. But of the Temple as the unique centre of Israel's worship, he had no thought. Instead of the elaborate ritual ascribed to him, he was content with the very modest service rendered by two priests. Our earliest accounts of him make him a musician, and a musician was also a poet. But whatever the nature of the songs which he sang as he whirled in ecstasy before the Ark, they were not the Psalms which have come down to us under his name. The dirges over Saul and over Abner which have come down to us, have strong claims to be considered genuine. But they are remarkable chiefly for the absence of any such religious faith or feeling as we find in the Psalter. We must be content with thinking of David's religion as of a very primitive type.

CHAPTER IX

SOLOMON

SOLOMON BEN DAVID came into possession of a united kingdom, a full treasury, and the rule over various conquered districts. It is probable that he did not seek to carry further the military policy of his father, but that he contented himself with developing and enjoying the resources at his command. Between the lines of the narrative which has come down to us we are able to read that his method was that of the average oriental despot. The first impression made by the record is different. Hebrew writers of a later time, themselves oppressed and impoverished, looked back at Solomon's reign as, in more senses than one, a golden age. They were dazzled by the extent of his kingdom (which indeed they imagined to be greater than it really was) and by the amount of his wealth—he made silver in Jerusalem like stones, and cedar timber like the sycomores of the Shephela. This estimate has passed current to our own times.

Whether the statements of the king's wealth and luxury are more or less exaggerated is a minor matter. The point that interests us, and which the narrative sufficiently brings out, is the mistaken statecraft of the ruler whose motto might well have been: *The state—I am the state*. In this view, a kingdom is the private estate of the monarch, to be exploited for his personal gain, or according to his personal fancy. Heavy taxes were laid upon the tribes,¹ and the free Israelites were made to render unpaid service in the forests and the mines. Trade and commerce were indeed fostered, but they were the king's enterprises, whose profits went into his own treasury. That the personal wealth of the king became enormous need not excite our wonder.

The list of Solomon's officers² shows at once the greater complexity of his establishment as compared with that of David.

¹ Judah, the king's own tribe, was perhaps exempt.

² 1 Kings, 4. Gray acutely conjectures, from the form of the names, that many of these officers were foreigners; *Hebrew Proper Names* (1896), p. 73.

We find now a special officer set over the provincial governors, and also a steward of the palace. But the most radical innovation was the partition of the kingdom into twelve districts, over each of which a pasha was appointed. The twelve districts did not correspond to the tribal divisions, as these are commonly given by tradition. But we must remember that the tribes were never strictly defined geographical divisions, whereas for the purposes of taxation the districts must be rigidly defined.¹ We might suspect the tribal boundaries ignored with the purpose of breaking them down, and so reducing the nation to uniformity. But this would be attributing to Solomon a foresight of which he gave no other evidence.

By what we should regard as a crude arrangement, each of these pashas supplied the palace with provisions one month in the year.² No more recondite reason for the number of districts need be sought than the fact that there are twelve months in the year. The taxes were levied and paid in kind. We hear nothing of any fixed rate, but there are some indications that a tenth of the produce was the ordinary amount.³ We may suppose that the method of collection was left to the discretion of the officer in charge. The way was thus opened to extortion and oppression. We must remember, also, that the levying of direct taxes has always been objected to in the East. The sovereign has his private estate, and a share of the booty taken in war—why should he take the property of his subjects? From this point of view the offensiveness of the new order in Israel can be imagined.

More offensive, no doubt, was the *corvée*. This institution is apparently as old as the monarchy in the East—Egypt has employed it from earliest times. It goes upon the theory that the subjects of a monarch are his slaves, and are bound to do his work without pay. So Samuel threatens the people that the king whom they desire will impress their sons to do his ploughing

¹ The twelve divisions of Solomon may have helped fix the tradition of twelve tribes of Israel—which never were twelve in fact; cf. Luther, “Die Israelitische Stämme” in the *Zeitsch. f. d. Alttest. Wissensch.*, XXI, p. 33 ff.

² The months were, of course, lunar months. This necessitated intercalation of a thirteenth month about once in three years. Who was responsible for this thirteenth month? Was Judah then called upon? It would be interesting to have more details.

³ In the passage alluded to below, Samuel threatens the people that the king will tithe their fields and vineyards, 1 Sam. 8¹⁵.

and reaping, and to run before his chariots. The women, also, will be compelled to serve as embroiderers and as cooks. The result will be to make the Israelites slaves instead of freemen. The threat here put into the mouth of Samuel is a composition of very late date; but it represents, probably enough, the feeling of the people under every despotic ruler during their history.

Had Solomon contented himself with requiring service for works of public utility in his own country, it would not have been so bad. But he made a levy for service on foreign soil. The oldest statement on the subject seems to be that he enlisted thirty thousand men for the work in Lebanon, dividing them into three sections, each of which was on duty one month at a time. We have, however, an additional statement that there were also seventy thousand carriers, and eighty thousand stone-cutters in the mountains.¹ There is nothing incredible in these figures. For the building of the temple, in connexion with which the Biblical author makes the statement, the figures are, no doubt, too large, but when we consider the multitude of other works undertaken by the king, they do not seem exaggerated. The building mania, which had so often brought monarchs into difficulty, attacked Solomon. He not only rebuilt his capital, but he fortified various cities of military importance.² The narrator knows also of other cities, cities for the chariot force, cities where the supplies were stored, in all of which building would be undertaken on a large scale. It should be noticed that the writer tries to shield the king from the charge of enslaving Israel, by insisting that he put to labour only the remnant of the Canaanites. But, as we have seen, a large part of Israel was of mixed blood; the Canaanitish elements had been assimilated, so that any endeavour to impress these alone would infallibly affect Israelites also. And the revolt of ten tribes of Israel after Solomon's death was based on the fact that the yoke had pressed heavily on all alike.

¹ 1 Kings, 5²⁷⁻³⁰. Two statements by different authors are here combined. One refers to the work in the Lebanon region, the other to the work carried on in Palestine itself. As we find an officer of David's "over the forced labour" (2 Sam. 20²⁴) it is probable that David introduced the system, but he cannot have carried it to such lengths as Solomon.

² 1 Kings, 9¹⁵⁻¹⁹. The cities named are at strategic points. They are all in Palestine, so we need not longer cherish the extravagant hypothesis which identifies one of them with Palmyra.

The life of Solomon presents itself to us, therefore, as that of a decidedly worldly prince. The king's pride was his wealth, his costly buildings, his stores of treasure. The useless luxury of gold shields for his body-guard throws light upon his taste and his aspirations. He thought to vie with the kings of the world in pomp and luxury. The monarch with whom he came most closely into contact was Hiram of Tyre—possessor of a small country, but of great wealth.¹ The relation of the two monarchs is not altogether clear. The statement that Solomon delivered to the Tyrian a large amount of grain and oil yearly, looks as though he were tributary, and the fact that later he ceded a considerable strip of territory also indicates that the Phœnicians had the advantage. What Solomon gained by the alliance was knowledge of the Phœnician manner of trading. As ruler of Edom he had possession of the port of Eloth, at the head of the gulf of Akaba. Here he built ships and sent his own servants, under Phœnician masters, to trade with Arabia. The profits went into the king's coffers. As Arabia was a gold-producing country, we need not suppose that South Africa was reached by these fleets. Whether the commerce of India reached him by this route is not certain. The list of products imported has sometimes been interpreted in this sense. But one or two obscure words in a comparatively late text can hardly establish the conclusion. The money value of the importations, four hundred and twenty talents in a single voyage, must be viewed with suspicion.²

Horses and chariots had never been adopted by the Israelites, owing to the nature of their country. David hamstrung the horses he captured in war, reserving only a few for purposes of

¹ What tradition tells about Hiram has been gathered by Movers, *Die Phönizier*, II, 1, p. 326 ff. Our main authority is Josephus, who quotes from Greek historians. The letters of Solomon and Hiram, with which the history is embellished (*Antiq.*, VIII, 50–56) are evidently Josephus's own composition.

² 1 Kings, 9²⁸; cf. 10¹⁴, where a much larger sum is given as the king's income for a year. Such data cannot be more than conjectures. The Kings of Babylon and of Egypt engaged in commerce on their own account, cf. Winckler in Schrader, *Keilinschriften und Altes Testament*³, p. 238. Winckler thinks that Solomon engaged in these expeditions as Hiram's vassal, but there seems to be no evidence of this. His cession of twenty villages (1 Kings, 9¹¹) only shows that Hiram was shrewd enough to get his partner into his debt.

show. Solomon was the first to make extensive importation of horses and chariots. Even here he seems to have had an eye to the profits, for the Syrian countries were the source of supply for Egypt, and the king might make this trade as well as the Arabian a monopoly.¹

If we may credit the Hebrew accounts, Solomon went beyond any ancient monarch in the luxury of the harem. The enormous number of wives and concubines attributed to him must be made up by counting all the female slaves of the palace among the concubines. Even then the figures must be grossly exaggerated.² The desire to cement alliances with his neighbours led him to take a large number of foreign princesses. The chief of these was the daughter of the reigning Pharaoh. Her father captured the town of Gezer, till then unsubdued by the Israelites, and gave it to her as a marriage portion. The great kingdom of Egypt always looked down upon all smaller countries, and doubt has been thrown upon our account for this reason. But Palestine under a single ruler was a neighbour whose friendship was well worth cultivating. The importance which this wife had in Solomon's eyes is seen by the fact that he built a separate palace for her alone, out of all the list.³ As it turned out, a change of dynasty in Egypt made the alliance of short duration.

Next to his wealth (illustrated in his harem), the wisdom of Solomon is emphasised by the sacred writer. No doubt the average man associates the wealth and the wisdom. Solomon could not so successfully have exploited his kingdom unless he had uncommon ability—this is the reasoning which first led men to call the king wise. This reputation once established, tradition interpreted the wisdom more generously. The ruler who is chief

¹ The original text (1 Kings, 10²⁸) is probably to be corrected, according to Winckler's conjecture, so as to state that the importers of horses brought them from Muçri and Kue, countries of North Syria. The forwarding to Egypt is therefore not indicated in the text, though it may be conjectured.

² The received text gives 700 wives and 300 concubines. The two items are not in the right proportion, and we are inclined to suspect that 70 wives and 300 concubines was the original statement (so Klostermann conjectures in his commentary).

³ A discussion of which particular Pharaoh honored Solomon with his alliance will be found in the *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenl. Gesellschaft*, LIV, p. 24 f.

justice of his people needs shrewdness to detect the false pleas that will be brought before him. The example of the two women whose case he decided shows that the king was credited with practical common-sense and knowledge of human nature in his administration of justice. The example before us may be classed with Sancho Panza's skilful adjudication of the test cases brought before him when he assumed the government of his island. Many an Arab Emir shows similar mother-wit in dealing with litigants.

In allowing Solomon so much wisdom, we need not discredit the tradition which ascribes to him the composition of apothegms such as are contained in our book of Proverbs. Sententious saying, enigmas to test the wit of the social circle, maxims for the conduct of life, have been the stock-in-trade of oriental sages from very early times. While it is impossible with any certainty to affirm that a single one of the Proverbs comes from Solomon, the book shows the kind of wisdom ascribed to him, and which he very likely possessed. The questions and answers with which he astonished the Queen of Sheba were enigmas and riddles such as the East delights in to the present day. Intellectual keenness is doubtless quickened by them, but they make no permanent contribution to man's store of knowledge. Our botanical science need not mourn the loss of Solomon's sayings concerning trees, "from the cedar in Lebanon to the hyssop that grows out of the wall."

More important for posterity than either Solomon's wisdom or his wealth was the Temple. This importance, however, was not dreamed of by Solomon himself. To him the Temple was only one, and that not the chief one, of the many buildings which he erected. In the adornment of his capital he planned for the extension and rebuilding of the city wall and the erection of an extensive group of buildings which we might call his castle. This group included not only the king's residence, the palace for his chief wife, and the apartments of his other wives, but also a great hall of audience for state occasions, a smaller hall of judgment, and the Temple. The whole group was surrounded by a single wall which made it a citadel. The site was in all probability that of David's citadel, only enlarged by taking in more of the hill. Retaining walls such as were afterward built by Herod would make the ground sufficiently level. But that the natural uneven-

ness of the site was not wholly overcome, is indicated by the constancy of usage which speaks of *going up* from the palace to the Temple.¹ We may suppose, therefore, that the highest part of the hill was occupied by the sanctuary—as was the case also with the village high places. Next to it on the south was the palace, lower down were the houses of the town.

The Old Testament writer does not make the arrangement of the buildings altogether clear. In the nature of things we should expect the great audience hall to be at the south side—thus more accessible to the people. This hall, from the number of cedar columns it contained, was called the House of the Forest of Lebanon. It has been plausibly supposed that its upper story was used as an armory. Its dimensions are given as one hundred cubits by fifty.² From this great hall opened a smaller room also supported by columns. This served as antechamber to the throne room, which was also the judgment seat of the king. The throne itself was esteemed a marvel of art, made of gold and ivory, decorated with the figures of lions and of bulls.

Of the palace proper—the residence of the king and his household—the author can tell us nothing. All the more detailed is his account of the Temple. The importance which this building assumed in later history justifies his pains. It was, to be sure, not the King's purpose to build the single legitimate place of worship for all Israel. The Temple was to him one part of his castle—not exactly his private chapel, but the cathedral of his capital. Such a sanctuary might overshadow, it was not expected to supersede, others already in existence. The parallel between him and his father is exact. As David by bringing the Ark to Jerusalem did not interfere with the other sacred places of the land, so Solomon in giving the Ark a more gorgeous place of residence had no exclusive purpose. In the time of David, we find no surprise expressed that Absalom should vow a vow to the Yahweh of Hebron; and both Adonijah and Solomon hold their festivals at other shrines than the one in the palace. In like manner Solomon gives proof of his esteem for other sanctuaries than the one at Jerusalem, by going to Gibeon to worship.

¹ 2 Kings, 19¹⁴, 20⁵, 23², Jer. 26¹⁰.

² Say 170 feet by 85, 1 Kings, 7². A ground plan showing a plausible reconstruction of the whole group of buildings is given by Stade, *Geschichte*, I, p. 305; cf. also Benzinger's *Commentary* on 1 Kings, 5.

Here in an ancient Canaanitish city was a famous place of worship dedicated to Yahweh, which we have already had occasion to notice. Hither, therefore, came the young king to offer his sacrifices and to seek God's revelation.¹

This example is significant, because it shows that the thought of a single legitimate sanctuary was far from the king's mind. It may be said indeed that the Temple was not yet built—such a plea is in fact made by the Deuteronomic editor of the Book of Kings. But the Ark was in existence, it was in the palace of David, it was now in the possession of Solomon. Yet he chose to visit the ancient and celebrated shrine at Gibeon. His intention not to displace the older high places could not be more explicitly set before us. Even in Jerusalem numerous other altars existed down to the time of the Exile.

As we have seen, the site of the Temple was the summit of the hill on which Jerusalem was built. The *Harâm es-Sherîf* at Jerusalem still retains its ancient sacredness. In this large area, the central object covered by the Dome of the Rock is the original summit of the hill. As the sacredness of hill-tops is abundantly shown in the history of Semitic religion, we are authorised to conclude that this native summit is the original reason for the consecration of the place. We may go further, and conclude that it was already consecrated to the *genius loci* before David's capture of the city. In that case Yahweh simply adopted the locality already occupied by another god—as at Gibeon he had displaced the local Baal or become merged in him. This process of amalgamation, as we know, went on at many places throughout the country. Parallels in the history of religion are abundant. The mosques of Islam are in many places the older sanctuaries—some of the most notable having been Christian churches. Christian churches often represent ancient heathen temples. The wells or tombs of saints throughout Syria are the successors of shrines originally consecrated to Baal or Astarte.

To erect a permanent building for Yahweh is treated by at least some of the Hebrew writers as an innovation. This is hardly correct, as the sanctuary at Shiloh had doors, and a cham-

¹ Although it is not expressly so asserted, we may suppose that Solomon slept in the sanctuary in order to receive the revelation by a dream. This practice of incubation was widely spread in antiquity. Cf. Wiedemann, *Religion of the Ancient Egyptians*, p. 189.

ber in which the Ark was kept. Micah also had a house for his image. But no doubt the desert God had for the most part lived in a tent. In the majority of Canaanitish sanctuaries the sacred object was in the open air, though chambers were often built for the convenience of those eating the sacrificial meal.¹ The altar must, of course, be in the open air.

It is perhaps not without significance for our history, that Hiram of Tyre was a great temple builder. We can see how his example might influence Solomon. Unfortunately, no Phœnician temple has been preserved to us. But there are some indications that the plan of Solomon's Temple and its ornamentation followed Phœnician models.²

The essential thing in all the High-places was the sacred enclosure, within which was the altar and the object of worship. When the worshipper thought of the sanctuary it was this area which he had in mind—the *Harām* at Mecca is a familiar example. In this enclosure Solomon chose to place a building, as a residence for the divinity. Its essential part was a chamber twenty cubits on a side—cubes play a part in Semitic religion elsewhere, the Kaaba being the most conspicuous example. In this inner chamber the Ark—and it alone—was kept. The doors into the ante-room were usually left open, as we may infer from the way in which the Hebrew writer speaks of the staves of the Ark being seen³ from the outer room.

The outer room was twice as long as the inner, but of the same breadth and height. It was provided with a table for the sacred bread, and probably with a lamp.⁴ The altar of incense seems to be a later addition. In front of the ante-room was a vestibule ten cubits deep. Around three sides of the building was a series of small chambers arranged in three storeys. These were store-rooms for the convenience of the priests, and probably

¹ As at Samuel's home, 1 Sam. 9²².

² The simple *cella* which constitutes the temple of Amrit is, in idea, the Most Holy place of Solomon's Temple. See Perrot and Chipiez, *History of Art in Phœnicia* (1885), p. 105.

³ 1 Kings, 8⁸. The verse is not altogether clear, but warrants this conclusion.

⁴ If the modest temple of Shiloh kept a lamp burning, it is probable that Solomon's was at least as well furnished. The statement concerning the ten golden lamps, however, 1 Kings, 7⁴⁹, must be taken to be a late insertion in the text.

of the king himself. The royal treasures would nowhere be more safe than in the immediate presence of the divinity. Contributions to the Temple were paid in kind; votive offerings would come in abundance in the course of time; the vestments and implements of service must be kept within the sacred area; perhaps the sanctuary was early made a place of safe keeping for valuables belonging to individuals, as we know it was in later times. The need of such chambers is thus easily conceived.

The house was built to face the east. Its walls were massive, of hewn stone. The stone was cut and fitted before it was brought to the spot where it was to be used. Doubtless this was in deference to a superstition concerning the use of iron in building a sacred house. The oldest legislation of the Hebrews forbids building an altar of hewn stone, because the lifting of a tool upon it defiles it.¹ The interior was panelled with cedar wood. The statements concerning figures carved in the panels, and concerning the gold overlaying are apparently late insertions into the text.

The implements of service were cast in copper by a Phœnician artificer. Among these the first place must be given to the two great pillars which stood at each side of the door. These were about thirty feet high, and had a diameter of six feet. Each of them had an elaborate capital ornamented with pomegranates. Their importance was such that they received names, one being called Jachin and the other Boaz. These names are as yet unexplained, and have perhaps been mutilated.² We must see in these columns enlarged examples of the *masséboth* or pillars which always stood by the altars of Yahweh in the early time, but which later times rejected as idolatrous. Parallels are found in the pillars which stood before the temple of Melkarth at Tyre, and those

¹ Ex. 20²⁵. Until very recent times traces of the same idea were found in the East. Thus, the smiths constitute a separate class, caste, or clan, in almost all oriental countries. The reluctance to have surgical operations performed is motived by a dread of the uncanny properties of iron, Russell's *Aleppo*² (1794), II, p. 136. Abundant parallels from other religions will be found in Frazer, *The Golden Bough*², I, pp. 344-352.

² Conjectural emendations are given by Cheyne, *Enc. Bib.* col. 2304. Sketches of the pillars, or a plausible reproduction, may be seen in Stade, *Geschichte*, I, p. 332; in Kittel, *Handkommentar*, p. 62; Benzinger, *Die Bücher der Könige*, p. 44, and in Schick, *Stiftshütte, Tempel und Tempelplatz* (1896), p. 83. The last-named work is of great value because written by an architect who has spent most of his life in Jerusalem. It proceeds, however, on an entirely uncritical view of the Hebrew text.

which the author of the treatise on the Syrian Goddess¹ saw at Hierapolis, and which he took to be phalli.

Next in importance to these must be rated the great tank called the Sea. The description is of a round reservoir ten cubits in diameter and five deep, made of copper mounted on twelve bulls of the same metal. Three of the bulls faced each point of the compass. As twelve is an astronomical number, it may not be too bold to see in these bulls symbols of the constellations, in which case the Sea is a symbol of the great celestial reservoir from which the earth is watered. Similar "seas" are mentioned in Assyrian temples, and large vases of stone found in Phœnician sanctuaries may be brought into the same class.² The sacredness of water has always been emphasised in the East, as is seen in the worship of springs, to which the Old Testament itself testifies. This alone would account for the great Sea in the Temple. For the practical purpose of ablution ten smaller tanks (lavars) were provided, each holding forty baths.³ Each of these was provided with a waggon on four wheels so that it could be moved from place to place as wanted. They were ornamented with figures in relief, of lions, bulls, cherubs, and palm trees. The bulls were sacred to Yahweh (or Baal), lions were the symbol of Astarte, the cherubs were well-known mythological figures, and the palms were also probably sacred. The significance of the ornamentation, therefore, is plain; it indicated a syncretistic purpose in the building of the Temple. The multitude of smaller implements, pots, shovels, bowls, need not detain us, but we may notice the table for the twelve loaves of bread kept constantly before the face of Yahweh. This "bread of the presence" is as

¹ This is reckoned among the works of Lucian. The reference is *De Dea Syria*, XVI. The two pillars at Tyre are mentioned by Herodotus, II, 44. See also the façade of the temple of Paphos, showing two similar pillars, in Perrot and Chipiez, *Art in Phœnicia*, p. 123.

² Reconstruction in Stade's *Geschichte*, I, p. 336 (copied by Benzinger). Compare the Amathus vase (nine feet in diameter) pictured in Perrot and Chipiez, *Phœnicia*, p. 290.

³ This amounts to over four hundred gallons for each. Figures of these "lavars" and their bases are given in Stade, *Geschichte*, I, p. 341, and Benzinger, p. 49. Cf. also the later study by Stade in the *Zeitschr. für die Alttest. Wissensch*, XXI (1901), pp. 145-190. This illustrates its subject by the bronze "bases" recently discovered in Cyprus, which are quite similar (except in size) to those in the Temple. On reservoirs of water in Babylonian temples see *Keilinschr. und Altes Test.*,³ p. 525.

old as the time of David, 1 Sam. 21⁴⁻⁶, though Babylonian parallels are cited.¹

The cherubim are important for their association with other parts of the sanctuary. Two of them, of gigantic size, were placed in the Most Holy Place, where, with their outstretched wings, they overshadowed or shielded the Ark. From indications in other parts of Scripture, we gather that they were composite figures, intended to represent guardian demons or deities.² The winged bulls with human heads, so common in Assyria, are analogous, and may be the originals. But other religions show similar fantastic creations.

Our account of the temple and its furniture makes no mention of the altar, or rather, it makes an allusion without a description.³ It is usually supposed that this is due to a late scribe who left out the description of the altar to make room for the old altar of the Tabernacle, which he supposed to be transferred to the Temple. So violent a procedure, however, must not be assumed without strong evidence. Even if a copyist had been bold enough to make the omission, he would have given us distinct information that the old altar was found sufficient. On the same principle, he should have left out the table of shewbread. It remains probable, therefore, that the original account said nothing of the altar. How can this be possible? Looking carefully at the narrative, we discover at the end of the prayer of dedication, this curious statement: "In that day Solomon consecrated the middle of the court which is before the Temple of Yahweh, for he offered there the burnt-offering, and the fat of the peace-offering." The second half of the verse, which assigns the smallness of the copper altar as the reason for the king's act, may be only the late author's endeavour to account for a fact which had come down to him by tradition.⁴

¹ *Keilinschr. und Altes Test.*,³ p. 600. The number twelve is common to the two religions.

² The word *cherub* is not yet satisfactorily explained. On the Biblical conception the best discussion seems to be that of Vatke, *Biblische Theologie*, I, pp. 325-334. Compare also the articles in recent Bible Dictionaries. Winged figures in Phœnician art are illustrated by Perrot and Chipiez, *Phœnicia*, p. 134. It should be noted that lions are often used in decoration in Phœnician art, as in the Temple.

³ 1 Kings, 9²⁵. The verse is an insertion in the text.

⁴ The verse is 1 Kings. 8⁶⁴. The context is recognised to be of post-Deuteronomic authorship.

It may be doubted, further, whether a late author would have invented a statement of this kind. In the middle of the court was the precise spot where the altar should have stood. Did Solomon remove the altar after it was once set in place? This seems impossible. Moreover, we must raise a question whether a copper altar is conceivable at this period. All the altars in Israel were of stone or earth. If hewn stone was an unlawful innovation, we should expect metal to be out of the question.

In Semitic religion, we are able to show that, in some cases at least, the altar was the sacred stone to which the place was dedicated.¹ In the sanctuary at Jerusalem, the original sacred object was the native stone summit of the hill, and this occupied the centre of the court before the House of Yahweh. This then constituted the original altar of the sanctuary. Whether the excavation in the rock, which reminds us of the pit at the base of Arabic altars, existed so early, may well be doubted. But, on our hypothesis, we find new reason for Isaiah's calling Jerusalem *Ariel*—or *Altar-hearth*.²

Other gods than Yahweh were worshipped in the Temple. This appears from many indications. The frequent efforts made by kings of Judah to purify the sanctuary, that is, to unify the worship there, show how tenaciously the other gods held their places. This they could not have done had not antiquity been on their side. Who so likely as Solomon (the lover of horses) to introduce the horses of the sun into the sacred precincts? Ezekiel complains that the abominations of the nations had shrines in the courts of Yahweh; and when the same author describes men worshipping images engraved on the walls, we think of the cherubim, palms, and lions of Solomon's time. The worship of foreign gods by Solomon himself is a plain matter of history. The indulgence of the Hebrew writers for their hero causes them to shield him by throwing the blame upon his wives. These are said to have turned his heart to other gods. But the statement is in itself improbable. Granting that the wife did not adopt the god of her husband, and that therefore the foreign princesses should have their private chapels, this was no reason that their husband should join in the worship. The original kernel of the account is the statement that "Solomon built a sanctuary for Chemosh, the god of

¹ Cf. W. R. Smith, *Religion of the Semites*, p. 184 ff.

² Is. 29¹; the word occurs also in the inscription of Mesha.

Moab, and for Moloch, the god of the Ammonites.”¹ Undoubtedly these sanctuaries were in Jerusalem, though the later author could not bear to think this, and removed them to the Mount of Olives.

The motive for naturalising these gods in Jerusalem is not far to seek. Moab and Ammon were peoples kindred to Israel. Their territory was part of the same kingdom. It was right, in the view of the ruler, that these peoples should be conciliated and that their divinities should be recognised. It is nothing surprising, therefore, to find the tutelary deities of all Solomon’s subjects united in a pantheon—the king’s new Temple at Jerusalem. Statecraft would suggest such a step. The religion of Yahweh was not at this period sufficiently exclusive to protest against it. We shall be attributing later motives to the king if we suppose him to be a universalist, to whom all religions were equally true, and who found the one God in all the objects of worship. Rather must we suppose him a believer in the multitude of gods, each of whom ought to be conciliated in the interest of the throne and the nation.

The inclusiveness of Solomon’s worship did not imply that Yahweh was no more to him than the other gods. Doubtless he felt that Yahweh was nearer to him than the others, and that He was the God of Israel in a sense in which the others could never be. This was indicated by the fact that the central point of the Temple, the Most Holy Place, was appropriated to Him. At the dedication the king recited this verse:

Yahweh has set the sun in the heavens,
But Himself has willed to dwell in darkness.
I have therefore built Thee a house to dwell in,
A home for Thee for eternity.

It is pleasant to think that this correctly expresses the spirit in which the building of the Temple was undertaken.²

¹ 1 Kings, 11¹. The word for sanctuary is *bama*, which is the same often translated *High-place*. The words of the Hebrew text, *on the mount east of Jerusalem*, are not original, as we see from Origen’s *Hexapla*, which puts them under the asterisk.

² The long prayer of dedication and the benedictions in 1 Kings, 8, are so evidently a late composition that we must leave them out of view. The verse given above seems to represent the earliest tradition of the dedication speech. We cannot be sure that even this goes back to the time of Solomon. For correction of the text, consult the recent commentaries.

The Temple contained many things at which later Jewish exclusiveness would have shuddered. Not only were symbols set up which were later called idolatrous, but the Temple servants were of a class later abhorred. As we know from Ezekiel, it was the custom of the Kings of Judah to endow the sanctuary with slaves captured in war. These were not only trained to do the work of the Temple, but we have reason to believe that some of them were consecrated to the obscene rites with which the Canaanitish Baal was worshipped. That Solomon was the first to introduce these foreign slaves into the sanctuary is perhaps indicated by the fact that after the Exile a class of Temple servants were still called "Sons of the servants of Solomon."¹

The reign of Solomon was not only the culmination of Israel's worldly glory; it was also the beginning of its decline—so soon does decay follow maturity. The various parts of the kingdom were held together by no internal bond. The rule of the monarch enforced a unity so long as it was rigorous. But even in Solomon's lifetime it began to relax, and the provinces moved for their independence. The most ancient account which has come down to us speaks of the revolt of Edom. We learn that at the subjugation of this country by David, one prince of the royal house (a small boy) escaped to Egypt. Here he was welcomed by the Pharaoh, who brought him up with his own children. At the death of David, the now adult prince returned to Edom and re-established himself on the throne. How extensive his territory was we cannot say; the fact that Solomon retained command of the caravan route to the Gulf of Akaba indicates that Edom did not regain all that had belonged to it earlier. The great empires of the East have continually shown the phenomena which here appear on a small scale.² The readiness of

¹ Neh. 7⁵⁷⁻⁶⁰, Ezra, 2⁵⁵. In both passages they are classed with the *Nethinim*, who are known to be descendants of Temple slaves, cf. Ezra 8²⁰. That some of them were Canaanites is indicated by the tradition that Joshua reduced the people of Gibeon to the position of *slaves of the sanctuary*, Josh. 9²³⁻²⁷.

² The account of the revolt of Edom, 1 Kings, 11¹⁴⁻²², is confusing, because it is made up from two different documents. One tradition made Hadad brought up by Pharaoh's wife, the other made him marry the queen's sister. There are indications also that a Midianite prince has been mixed up with this Hadad. Winckler (*Alttest. Untersuch.*, pp. 1-15) first called attention to the literary phenomena. I cannot discover the necessity for substituting the North Arabian *Mucri* for *Egypt* in this passage.

Egypt to foster disintegration in Palestine need cause no remark.

From another hand we have the story of Rezon. This hero is described as a bandit captain who established himself in the region of Lebanon, and who finally got possession of Damascus. Here he founded a kingdom, which later became a standing menace to Israel. He belongs in this connexion only if he took away territory belonging to Solomon. It is probable that he did take away such territory, for David made tributaries in this region. The further remark that Rezon "was Israel's enemy all the days of Solomon," indicates that his revolt took place early in the reign.¹

More serious was the revolt of Jeroboam ben Nebat, because it affected the very centre of the kingdom. It was suppressed, however, during Solomon's life, and so the discussion of it does not belong in this chapter. Solomon is said to have reigned forty years. Tradition magnified his wealth and his wisdom, and as time went on the conviction arose that if he had been a wise man, he could not have found satisfaction in luxury and idolatry. So he became, in the latest Jewish literature, a type of the penitent roué who has tried all the resources of earth, only to find them impotent to give happiness. Whether the real Solomon ever had such an experience is impossible to say. All that the record pictures is an oriental despot, luxurious and oppressive, but possibly good-natured and genial in personal intercourse. Of statesmanship, in our sense of the word, he had not the faintest glimmer. His religion was of the type held by his contemporaries. Nothing can be attributed to him that really advanced Israel in its world mission.

Concerning the social condition of the people during the reigns of David and Solomon, we know little. On the side of religion, we know that when the Israelites entered Canaan they brought their God Yahweh with them. But they found a fully developed religion already in possession of the country. Everywhere there were sanctuaries to the local Baal. This god was worshipped as the god of fruitfulness, and the harvests which made the peasant's wealth were his gift. We can hardly suppose

¹ The account, 1 Kings, 11²³⁻²⁵, has suffered in transmission. The editor was apparently anxious to pass as lightly as possible over these unpleasant incidents.

the nomads to naturalise their Yahweh at once as lord of the land. It would be their thought that the god of the cultivated land would know better than the god of the desert how to make the harvests grow. We can understand, if we do not excuse, the continual tendency of the Israelites to seek the favour of Baal—a tendency of which the prophetic writers complain without ceasing.

We may go further. We have found abundant reason to suppose that the conquest of Canaan was really a gradual amalgamation of Israelites and Canaanites. The two people lived side by side (in many communities) on friendly terms. The alliances by which they secured mutual rights were entered into by recognition of each other's divinities. Baal and Yahweh were respected, and in some cases worshipped, by both parties. Baal admitted Yahweh to his sanctuaries—nay, the process went so far that Baal and Yahweh were identified. The meaning of Baal (*Lord*) facilitated the identification. It was easy to say that Yahweh was the Baal of Israel. Names borne by sons in the family of Saul, and in the family of David (*Ishbaal*, *Baaljada*) show how deep-rooted was the idea.¹ On the other hand we find the Canaanites adopting Yahweh. Gibeon, as we know, was an ancient Canaanitish city. The people were reckoned Canaanites in the time of David. Yet the sanctuary of their city was the sanctuary of Yahweh, for it was *before Yahweh* that they impaled the sons of Saul. More striking still, it was this Canaanitish sanctuary which Solomon chose out of all the high places of the land, when he wanted to honour the God of Israel.²

What had taken place here, had taken place all over the land. Yahweh was no longer the God of the desert, or of Horeb;³ He had become the God of the land, and David complained that in exile from Canaan he was banished from the presence of Yahweh.⁴ The ancient sanctuaries of Canaan were in a position to exercise a strong fascination on immigrant Israel. They had an-

¹ Perhaps the most significant indication is the name Baaliah (1 Chr. 12⁵) which is given as the name of one of David's captains and which means *Yahweh-is-Baal*. The place-names Baal-Judah and Baal-Perazim (the latter given by David) are also significant of the amalgamation.

² Cf. what was said above (p. 163) about the adoption of old sanctuaries in a new religion.

³ Although Horeb no doubt retained its ancient sanctity. This we see from the story of Elijah.

⁴ 1 Sam. 26¹⁹.

tiquity in their favour; their ritual was ornate and sensuous; they were the centres of civilisation, of trade, and of dissipation. That they should maintain their influence is what we might expect. Syncretism resulted, even in the Temple at Jerusalem.

Socially and politically, the old tribal organisation was still strong. The people had become cultivators, but the institutions of the desert survived. In imposing the machinery of taxation, the king had no thought of changing the social order. The new pashas and the old sheikhs lived side by side. The old customary law was still administered in the gates. Although the king was chief justice, and an appeal to him was open to any subject, there seems to have been no attempt to appoint subordinate judges by his authority. Had Solomon been the originator of improvements in the legal system, tradition would almost certainly have known something of it. A recently discovered monument of early Babylonian jurisprudence, shows us what might reasonably have been expected of a Hebrew king who was noted for his wisdom. This monument is the code of Hammurabi, king of Babylon.¹ The monarch who promulgates it regards himself as commissioned by the gods "to establish justice in the land, to destroy the wicked in order that the powerful may not injure the weak," and a relief sculptured on the pillar possibly represents him receiving his laws from the sun-god. No doubt Babylonian and Hebrew ideas are alike, in that Yahweh also was the guardian of right and the source of legislation; the example of Moses shows as much. Solomon may well have looked upon himself as divinely commissioned to administer justice. Tradition makes him pray for wisdom and gives a legal decision of his as an example of the wisdom intended. But Solomon nowhere saw the royal opportunity to codify and publish the law of the land for the guidance of his subjects or of his officials. In this he was behind his Babylonian predecessor.

This example is instructive as showing how little Babylonian influence was found in Palestine. There can be no doubt that at one time this influence had been paramount there. But that time

¹ A German translation is published by Winckler, *Die Gesetze Hammurabi's* (1902), and an English translation of Winckler's German is given in the New York *Independent* for January 8, 15, and 22, 1903. Hammurabi's reign is dated about 2000 B.C.; Solomon's coronation may be placed approximately at 970 B.C.

was long past. The Israelite invasion had done away with Babylonian institutions. The people who came in from the desert brought their own laws—or rather lack of laws—with them. Now, no doubt, in a society comparatively settled, they were developing a system of common law. The earliest Hebrew code which has come down to us¹ was published at a date considerably later than the time of Solomon. But it embodies usage which is as old as Solomon or older, and we may use it to throw light upon the social conditions of the time. Its simplicity when compared with the code of Hammurabi confirms its independence. The points of resemblance, some of which are striking, are features common to oriental society.

The chief interest of the legislator was in the rights of property. The most important class of property was slaves, if we may judge from its heading the list. A Hebrew might be sold into slavery for debt. The code provides in such case that he shall not be held more than six years without his own consent. This, however, seems not to have been recognised as binding law at any time. The example shows that this code, in some cases, expressed the ideal of the writer, rather than actual practice. It is interesting to notice that the author assumes that there will be household gods in each dwelling—reminding us of the teraphim in David's house.

A Hebrew girl (it is assumed) is likely to be sold into concubinage, which is, in fact, the recognised form of marriage. In such a case, sale to another master will be a hardship, and the right of the master is limited so that he must allow her own family to redeem her. Polygamy is recognised, care being taken only that the different wives shall be treated alike. The one discriminated against may claim her freedom.

Murder is punished according to the custom of blood-revenge. Unintentional killing is now differentiated from murder, however, in so far that the altar of Yahweh provides an asylum for the manslayer if the killing be unintentional. Injury to a slave, inflicted by a master, was injury to a man's own property, and was not punishable unless death ensued immediately. Ordinary cases of injury by assault were punishable by *talio*—an eye for an

¹ The so-called Book of the Covenant, Ex. 20²²—23³³. Cf. Baentsch, *Das Bundesbuch* (1892), and his commentary on Exodus, p. 185 ff.; also Briggs, *Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch* (1897), pp. 211-232 and 242-255.

eye, a tooth for a tooth, wound for wound—doubtless the penalty was inflicted by the injured person or his next of kin. A large amount of attention is given to injury of cattle or by cattle, to damage of crops, to theft, and to loss of articles loaned or in safe keeping. Seduction of a virgin is treated as a damage to property.

If, as seems probable, the Book of the Covenant has preserved to us the first endeavour to write down some of the examples of case law,¹ its importance for literature is not inferior to its importance in legal development. The reign of Solomon would naturally foster literature. The new-felt unity of Israel would lead to a collection of Israel's traditions. Legends, long circulated orally, would now be put in written form. The poetic monuments of past achievements would be zealously sought. It is probable that considerable portions of the literature thus put into shape have come down to us imbedded in the works of later writers.

Among the productions of the period we may, with some confidence, put the so-called Blessing of Jacob.² A poet here puts

¹The oldest portions of the book probably contain notes of actual cases, written down, not as authoritative legislation, but for information on precedents. By far the greater part of the laws in this code are in the form of *judgments* (cf. Briggs, *Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch*, p. 252 ff.) which state a case hypothetically and then give the decision, as: "If a man smite another so that he die, he shall be put to death." It is noticeable that this is the form of the laws of Hammurabi. It seems probable also that the two codes were alike in arranging the laws in groups of five, though this is not rigorously carried through in either one. Specific points of resemblance are the following:

Thou shalt not suffer a maker of spells to live (Ex. 22¹⁸): If one cast a spell upon a man . . . he shall be put to death (Hammurabi 1).

If a man steal an ox or a sheep . . . he shall restore five oxen for an ox and four sheep for a sheep (Ex. 22¹): If a man steal an ox or a sheep or an ass or a swine belonging to a god or to the king, he shall restore thirty fold; if it belong to a freeman he shall restore ten fold (Ham. 8).

He that stealeth a man . . . shall be put to death (Ex. 21¹⁶): If one steal the minor son of another, he shall be put to death (Ham. 14).

If a thief be found breaking in and be smitten that he die, no blood shall be shed for him (unless the sun be risen, Ex. 22^{2f}): If one breaks into a house he shall be slain before the breach and buried there (Ham. 21).

On trespass of cattle, cf. Ex. 22⁵ and Ham. 57 f. On goods entrusted to another for safe keeping, cf. Ex. 22⁷⁻¹³ and Ham. 112. The talio is enforced by Ham. 196-201. The striking of a father is punished with death in both codes.

²Testament of Jacob would be a better name. It is found in Gen. 49.

into the mouth of Israel, the eponym of the nation, verses characterising the different tribes. Reuben has already lost his pre-eminence. Simeon and Levi have been punished for their inhumanity. But Judah has the suzerainty over his brothers. Dan and Gad live on the frontiers, where their valour defends their country from the raiders. Joseph is second only to Judah in the blessings which are allotted to him. With such appeals to the clans we may suppose the poet to rouse their emulation and stimulate their pride.

Other portions of the poetic anthologies cannot be pointed out with certainty. We may assume, however, with some probability, that the oldest sections of our historical books were written down in this period. Interest in the dynasty of David would make the life of that king one of the first subjects to be treated. We may also suppose that it now became the fashion at the more celebrated sanctuaries to have the traditions of the Patriarchs put into written form. Solomon's own interest in literature may have been genuine; in any case his reign was of permanent importance in the development of Israel, more from the stimulus it gave to literature than for its wealth or commerce.

CHAPTER X

FROM JEROBOAM TO JEHU

THE attempt of an ambitious satrap to make himself an independent monarch is a constantly recurring phenomenon in oriental history. Such attempts in the outlying districts of Solomon's kingdom we have already chronicled. Another in the centre of the kingdom need cause no surprise when we remember the fierce and haughty temper of Ephraim. Such an attempt was made during Solomon's life, though suppressed for the time being. It was headed by Jeroboam ben Nebat, a man of obscure origin, but of energetic character. According to our sources, he attracted the attention of Solomon, who promoted him to the position of overseer of the forced labour in the country of Ephraim. According to an intimation in the Greek version,¹ he fortified his native place Zereda, and enlisted chariots in his service. This almost ostentatious indication of an intention to revolt aroused the vigilance of Solomon, and Jeroboam was obliged to flee to Egypt. He found an asylum with Shishak (Sheshonk) a king not friendly to Solomon.² Here he watched the course of events, and apparently kept in communication with the Sheikhs of Ephraim. Change of the throne is usually the signal for civil disorders in the East, and so it proved in this case. As soon as Solomon's death was announced, Jeroboam returned to his native town, which was within easy reach of Shechem, the capital of Ephraim.

We remember Shechem as the city in which Abimelech had once set up his kingdom. The fact that Rehoboam, who succeeded to Solomon's throne in Judah without opposition, found it necessary to come hither for recognition shows how much of the old

¹ The passage partly duplicates the Hebrew text, but is in part original. It is printed by Swete (*Old Testament in Greek*), as 3 Kings, 12 ^{24 a-f}, in Lagarde's edition as 3 Kings, 12 ²⁵⁻³⁹.

² The statement that Shishak gave him his daughter in marriage seems to have come in by confusion with the story of Hadad.

tribal independence remained. Solomon had been fortunate in that he had been crowned during his father's lifetime, when the old king's prestige was sufficient to secure the allegiance of all divisions of the kingdom. The Sheikhs of Ephraim did not conceive that they had sworn loyalty to the dynasty of David for all time. The temper of the tribes was different from what it had been forty years earlier. They had experienced the rigour of despotism, and the Sheikhs had no hesitation in demanding relief: "Thy father made our yoke heavy; lighten thou the hard service of thy father and his heavy yoke, and we will serve thee." Whether specific demands were made—exemption from forced labour or a limitation of the amount—cannot now be made out.

The young king took time to consider, and to consult with his advisers. The older men counselled moderation—it was necessary to yield only this once in order to get the throne thoroughly established; afterward he would be able to do what he pleased. But the younger courtiers, brought up to look upon the common people as the born slaves of the monarch, advised no concessions. These, the playmates and boon companions of the prince, were the ones who had his ear. In accordance with their advice he responded to the deputation when they came for their answer: "My little finger is thicker than my father's loins." The single sentence¹ left no doubt concerning the speaker's estimate of his own powers, or concerning his purpose to exercise those powers to the full.

Though Jeroboam had returned from Egypt he does not seem to have been present at these negotiations. Probably he thought it would be better to be called by the people than to put himself forward as a leader. To start the revolt was easy. The cry was raised:

"What part have we in David,
Or portion in the son of Jesse?
To thy tents, O Israel!
Now look to thy house, David!"

It was the old war-cry kept in memory since the time of Sheba, the Bichrite. When it had aroused the people to arms, then

¹ It was unnecessary to add an explanation in the specific threat to make their yoke heavy and to chastise them with scorpions. This would have been insulting, and we may charitably suppose that the narrator has expanded the earliest account.

the need of a leader was felt, and Jeroboam was pointed out as the man for the hour. He was summoned from Zereda and took his place at the head of the movement.¹

No serious opposition could be offered by Rehoboam. He had no adequate armed force with him. In his infatuation he supposed that Adoniram, the chief overseer of the forced labour, would overawe the crowd. But the task-master only infuriated the people, and they stoned him to death, and the king was obliged to flee the city to avoid a similar fate. According to the narrative in our hands he called out the militia of Judah and would have attempted to regain his power had not a prophet interfered and warned him to desist. It is more probable that he found enough to do to keep the country immediately about Jerusalem. Judah indeed was loyal, but Benjamin had never been well affected toward the house of David, and it would now be strongly drawn toward the kindred tribe of Ephraim.² Hence we must suppose Rehoboam's work cut out for him near at hand. In fact the most ancient sources count the tribe of Judah alone as making up the kingdom of Rehoboam. Only such parts of Benjamin as could be overawed from Jerusalem were kept in his power.

The judgment of posterity on Jeroboam ben Nebat has been curiously influenced by religious prepossession. When our historical books received their present form, Judah alone was regarded as the people of Yahweh, the northern kingdom having perished. In seeking to interpret the ways of God, the author took the view that the revolt of Jeroboam was (although of divine appointment) rebellion against the legitimate rulers of Israel. It was also apostasy from the true religion, for the later time viewed the Temple at Jerusalem as the only authorised sanctuary of Israel's God. Our books of Kings proceed at once to pronounce judgment upon Jeroboam from this later point of view, and they repeat the

¹ 1 Kings, 12³⁻²⁰—one of the most vivid passages in the Old Testament.

² We must recognise that the narrative from this point on shows a strong religious bias. The latest author has no sympathy with the northern kingdom. The prophet who is made to forbid Rehoboam's campaign against Israel after he has called out the fighting men of Judah, is only one of several such anonymous figures introduced simply to give a moral lesson. The historicity of 1 Kings, 12²¹, is defended by some authors who reject the verses that follow. But the whole seems to be of a piece, and there is nothing in the language to make us divide the passage. That the relations of the two kingdoms would be strained is probable, cf. 1 Kings, 14²⁰.

judgment on his successors, who "departed not from his ways."⁵ Allowance must be made for this bias in reading the account. At the time of the revolt there was no consciousness of anti-religious motive on the part of the northern tribes, and probably no accusation of apostasy was made by Judah. We cannot help thinking that the division was regrettable, because it weakened the people. But the coherence of the tribes had never been very strong; Judah and Ephraim had always lived in jealousy of each other; the tyranny of Solomon had alienated whatever affection David had inspired. Only a succession of wise and strong rulers could have welded the independent clans that bore the name of Israel into a homogeneous people. Jeroboam deserves a place among those patriots who have roused a suffering people to throw off the yoke of oppression. What he did was morally certain to be done sooner or later.

If the majority should rule, Jeroboam's right was better than the right of Rehoboam. By far the most important part of the nation was Jeroboam's. He had the larger territory, the more fertile provinces, the more numerous subjects, and greater resources. The fertility of Ephraim was proverbial, while large parts of Judah were fitted only for pasture. It was not without right, therefore, that the northern kingdom called itself Israel. That its boundaries extended across the Jordan is indicated by the fact that Jeroboam fortified Penuel. The province of Moab, as we learn later, fell to Israel instead of Judah—as David's conquest it would seem to belong to the latter.

Of Jeroboam's reign we know little. He built a palace at Shechem, which had ancient claims to be considered the capital. His interest in religion was manifested by his care for the sanctuaries in his domain. Of these the most celebrated were Bethel and Dan. The former traced its sacred character to the Patriarch Jacob, who discovered there the presence of Yahweh, as well as the mysterious ladder which led thence to heaven. It was he, also, who erected the sacred pillar and inaugurated the cultus by pouring oil upon it. The stories mean, of course, that the place was a sanctuary before historic times, and this suggests that it was one of those taken over from the Canaanites. Dan also had a celebrated house of God, which dated from the Israelite occupation of the city, and whose priests traced their ancestry to Moses. Here there was an image of Yahweh, the title to which was the

right of the strongest, now confirmed by some centuries of possession. At Bethel the object of worship was the sacred stone.

Jeroboam's zeal for religion was manifested in that he adorned each of these sanctuaries with a golden bull. Under this form he supposed that the God of Isaael might be worshipped, for he expressly declared in setting them up that this was the God which brought Israel out of Egypt. The writer who gives us this account regards the whole transaction with disapproval,¹ and he assigns a political motive to the king—the fear that the people, by going to Jerusalem to worship, will be weaned away from him and turn back to Rehoboam. But this is plainly a later conception. There was no reason why the people should go to the temple to worship, for the land was full of sanctuaries. Even in Judah the Temple was not regarded as the only place of worship, for, as we know, the people were zealous in visiting the many high places there. No danger arose, or was likely to arise, to the throne of Jeroboam from the Temple.

We are driven to suppose, therefore, that Jeroboam was moved by zeal for the God of Israel. He was a worshipper of Yahweh, as is shown by his giving his son the name Abijah.² It is not unreasonable to suppose, further, that he was led to make the golden bulls by the established symbolism of the times. Whether the symbolism was the result of the adoption of Baal by Israel cannot clearly be made out. There are distinct traces of animal worship among the Hebrews in the earlier time, and among the animals none was more important to them than the bull. Before the introduction of the camel, neat cattle were the beasts of burden of the nomads. There is nothing improbable, therefore, in the supposition that in the desert Israel had worshipped Yahweh under the form of a bull.³

¹ 1 Kings, 12²⁵⁻³³. The passage is doubtless late, but it seems to be based on fact. The golden bulls are called *calves* by the Hebrew author because of their small size. It seems to be well established that Baal was worshipped under the form of a bull.

² *Yahweh-is-father* is the meaning of the name.

³ The story of the golden calf made by Aaron is too late to be taken as evidence, but a certain amount of weight may be allowed it in connexion with what has already been adduced, and it certainly assumes that so venerable a man as Aaron was capable of worshipping Yahweh under such an image. In one ancient passage (Gen. 49²⁴) Yahweh seems to to be called *the Bull of Jacob*.

Religious conservatism accounts, therefore, for the misunderstood act of Jeroboam. And the other deeds for which he is blamed by the Biblical writer must be judged in the same way. In appointing priests from the common people he was only following the example of David and Solomon. In celebrating a festival a month later than it was observed in Judah, he was probably conforming to the established custom of the northern tribes.

That in matters of religion Judah was not different from Israel is testified by the writer who is so ready to blame Jeroboam. He enumerates the "abominations" that were found in Judah, among which are the high places, the sacred stones, the sacred poles, and the religious prostitutes. "They did the like of all the abominations of the nations which Yahweh drove out before the sons of Israel."¹ We need no more explicit evidence of the syncretism of the period.

The author of the Book of Kings, on whom we must depend for our history, had a difficult task before him in following a double line of narrative, and he has not always succeeded in making his account entirely clear. His plan for this period is as follows: First he gives an account of Jeroboam, of whom he has almost nothing to tell. He then takes in order the three Judaic kings whose reigns were wholly or partly contemporaneous with that of Jeroboam. After carrying the last of these to its conclusion, he returns to the northern kingdom. Here he gives a continuous account down to the death of Ahab. For the kingdom of Judah he finds it necessary to give only a brief account of Jehoshaphat, and then resumes the other thread with the son of Ahab. This king was succeeded by his brother, within whose reign the son and grandson of Jehoshaphat came to the throne. The revolt of Jehu forms a convenient mark of division because it concerns both kingdoms—Jehu slew both the reigning monarchs, thus making Athaliah's accession in Judah synchronous with his own in Israel.

In this period, which we may estimate at about ninety years,

¹ 1 Kings, 14²³ f. The sacred pillars (*masséboth*) are stones erected at the sanctuary, like the one set up at Bethel by Jacob. The sacred poles (*asherim*) are stakes, also erected near the altar. Discussion of the significance of both will be found in the books on Old Testament archæology. The *masséba* is paralleled in old Arabic religion.

the most noticeable thing is the frequent change of dynasty in the northern kingdom. Judah seems to have settled on the house of David as its lawful rulers, but the principle of legitimacy scarcely obtained a foothold in Ephraim. Jeroboam, no doubt, had just cause against Solomon. But his success stimulated others to follow his example whether they had just cause or not. His own line lasted only through his son Nadab. This king was allowed to occupy the throne but two years when his general, Baasha by name, slew him and exterminated the family. When the rebellion broke out, the army was besieging Gibbethon, a Philistine fortress.¹ As Baasha is called a man of Naphtali, it may be that tribal jealousies were in play. But the revolt of a military leader against his sovereign is so constant a phenomenon in some stages of society, that speculation on special motives should be indulged with caution. Baasha seems to have been a man of ability, for he pushed his frontier down to Ramah, so that Asa, King of Judah, was obliged to call in foreign help. The incident will occupy us later. Of Baasha we know nothing further. His son seems to have been a weakling who occupied himself with the pleasures of the table in which the wine-cup had a prominent place. While at a carouse in the house of his major domo he was assassinated by one of his generals, Zimri by name, commander of half the chariot force.² The usual extermination of the family of the murdered king followed. So cold-blooded was the deed, that the name of Zimri became proverbial for an assassin.³ The crime did not long benefit the perpetrator. The greater part of the army was in the field, again engaged before Gibbethon. Seeing that they had the power in their hands, they proclaimed their general, Omri, king, and marched against the royal residence. The case was seen by Zimri to be hopeless, and he burned the palace over his own head, and so perished after scarcely a taste of power.⁴

¹ 1 Kings, 15²⁷; the site is not yet identified.

² 1 Kings, 16⁸⁻¹⁰. The king's name was Elah, and his residence was at Tirzah, a place which we know to have been celebrated for the beauty of its situation, but which has not been certainly identified.

³ So we seem to be justified in concluding from the language of Jezebel, 2 Kings, 9³¹.

⁴ The historian assigns him only seven days, but probably counts only to the beginning of the siege. It is curious to see how the fixed idea of the "ways of Jeroboam" affects the writer—even Zimri's death is said to be a

Another section of the army desired to try its hand at king-making and proclaimed its general, Tibni, as king. The ensuing civil war seems to have lasted some time,¹ but Omri was victorious. He established himself firmly on the throne, and under himself and his son, Ahab, Israel reached its greatest outward prosperity. Evidence that he impressed himself upon foreigners as an unusual man may perhaps be found in the Assyrian inscriptions, for in these Israel is the *House of Omri*, even after the rise of another dynasty.² The religious conflict which soon broke out will occupy our attention later.

Turning now to the little kingdom of Judah, about all we can say is that the house of David maintained itself through the period. The historian shows an utter lack of interest in political questions, while he is punctilious in pronouncing judgment upon the religious character of the different kings. This judgment is motivated, however, by the later (Deuteronomistic) view of the religion of Israel, and utterly foreign to that which a contemporary would have pronounced. Moreover, the grounds for the verdict are in almost every case obscure. We must suppose that there was a tradition concerning the attitude of the kings toward the sanctuary—a Temple chronicle or something of the kind. Rehoboam is accused of folly by the record we have already considered, in his inconsiderate treatment of the best part of his kingdom, resulting in his loss and shame. His mother is said to have been an Ammonite princess. According to the Greek version, she was a daughter of the Hanun upon whom David made war.³ Beyond this we know nothing of his reign, except that the King of Egypt—the Shishak of whom we have already heard—invaded the country, entered Jerusalem and carried off the rich treasure

punishment for his walking in these ways and making Israel to sin, though the reign of seven days would give no opportunity for the king to show his policy.

¹ Four years, if we may trust the data of the text. Compare 1 Kings, 16¹⁵, with 16²³.

² Cf. Schrader, *Keilinschriften und Altes Test.*², p. 189 (*Cuneiform Insc. and Old Test.*, I, p. 179).

³ 1 Kings, 12^{24a} (Swete's *O. T. in Greek*). The name of the queen-mother—the *Gebtra* or mistress of the palace—is regularly given in connexion with the name of the reigning monarch. In polygamous societies the mother always occupies a position of great influence, greater than that of any wife, for the wife may be supplanted at any time by a rival.

stored in the Temple.¹ It has been supposed that the Pharaoh was moved to this step by a desire to assist his friend Jeroboam. But the lists of Shishak himself seem to show that he did not draw the line at Judah, but also plundered the northern kingdom. No motive beyond a desire to seize the treasure at Jerusalem need be imputed to the invader. The smaller kingdoms were the natural prey of the stronger. Solomon's lavish use of gold was probably a matter of common fame. The gold shields of state carried by the royal guard on solemn occasions were captured at this time. They were replaced by Rehoboam with shields of copper.² What surprises us is that the Temple treasury, though often plundered, was so soon replenished.

The natural sequence of Shishak's invasion would seem to be the dependence of Judah upon Egypt and, in fact, it may have been the great king's object to reassert the supremacy maintained long before by his predecessors. The Hebrew writer is discreetly silent on the subject. Nor does he tell us anything of Rehoboam's son, Abijam,³ and his brief reign, except that he walked in all the sins of his father.

Asa, son and successor of Abijam, is more favourably spoken of. He is said to have expelled the impure hieroduli from the land, and to have deprived his mother of her position as mistress of the palace, because she was concerned in idol worship.⁴ The details of the alleged reform are obscure; we may suppose it a protest against the extreme tolerance shown by Solomon. More intelli-

¹ Shishak (the name is vocalised in various ways by the Egyptologists) came to the throne about 960 B.C. He was the founder of the twenty-second dynasty. Shishak's list of plundered cities is discussed by W. Max Müller, *Asien und Europa*, p. 166 ff., and also by Goldschmied in *Zeitschr. d. Deutschen Morgenl. Gesellschaft*, LIV, p. 17 f.

² The Greek version makes the booty to be the shields taken by David from Zobah. As their use when the king went to the temple is mentioned, we may suppose that the king and his guard performed their worship by a solemn procession (1 Kings, 14²⁵⁻²⁸).

³ The name was doubtless Abijah, which has become corrupted in our copies of 1 Kings. His mother is called daughter of Absalom, by which the notorious son of David may be meant.

⁴ She is charged (1 Kings, 15¹¹⁻¹³) with having made a *miphleqeth* for the ashera. The word *miphleqeth* is entirely obscure, but from the context it is easy to see that an idolatrous image is in the mind of the writer. The ashera, however, was in this period an entirely innocent accompaniment of the worship of Yahweh, so that there is some confusion in the mind of the writer, or else his text has been corrupted in transmission.

gible, though less commendable, is Asa's action with reference to Baasha, King of Israel. The two Hebrew kingdoms had been at enmity from the time of the division. Because Judah was much more affected by the Egyptian invasion than was Israel, or because it recuperated more slowly, Baasha was able to push his frontier down to Ramah, less than five miles from Jerusalem. Here he proposed to stay, and began to fortify the place. The inconvenience of a hostile fortress almost overlooking the capital, together with the shame of having a neighbour assert his predominance in the face of all the world, was more than Asa could bear. With short-sighted policy, he resorted to a measure which was repeated by his successors at different times with disastrous effect. He looked around for an ally who would make common cause with him against Ephraim. Such an ally he found in Israel's northern neighbour, Benhadad,¹ of Damascus. With the gold and silver at his command, including what had accumulated in the Temple since the incursion of Shishak, Asa bribed Benhadad to take his part. The Syrian, nothing loath, broke off his relations with Baasha, and by an attack on northern Israel forced him to withdraw from Ramah. The result was a substantial addition of territory to the kingdom of Damascus,² and the inauguration of warfare which became chronic between Syria and Ephraim. Judah received temporary relief, and Asa was able to recover Ramah, whose fortifications he razed, using the materials in strengthening his frontier at Geba and Mizpah. His action was no doubt interpreted by the Syrians as an act of submission which involved the regular payment of tribute and which thus laid the foundation for future troubles.

Omri, the founder of a new dynasty in Ephraim, removed the capital to Samaria. Doubtless a city had existed on this site from very ancient times. The strength of the position³ is shown

¹ I leave the name as it is in our Hebrew text, though there is some reason to suppose that the Aramaic original was different, cf. Winckler, *Alttestamentliche Untersuchungen*, p. 69 ff.

² The towns named are Ijon, Dan, and Abel-beth-maachah, all of which are in the extreme northern district. The text adds "and all Cinneroth, with the whole land of Naphtali." This would mean the district *west* of the Sea of Galilee, but it is doubtful whether the Syrians could permanently hold this part of Israel. The account is found in 1 Kings, 15¹⁶⁻³².

³ "A round isolated hill over three hundred feet high," in the centre of a fertile plain, cf. Robinson, *Biblical Researches*,² II, p. 304, G. A. Smith, *Hist. Geog.*, p. 346.

by the sieges which it withstood. The city remained the seat of government down to the destruction of the northern kingdom. Omri's ability is indicated not only by the prominence of his name in Assyrian annals, but also by the fact that he conquered or reconquered Moab, as we learn from the inscription of Mesha. The Hebrew historian accuses him of walking in the sins of Jeroboam, but this is the stereotyped charge against all the kings of Israel. The source from which the writer drew seems to have laid special stress upon the power of the king, but the details of that power and its exercise are lost to us.

Ahab, the son who succeeded to the throne, receives an evil name first because he married Jezebel, daughter of Ethbaal, king of the Sidonians, or, as we should put it, King of Tyre.¹ The foreign marriage was no more than had been customary with the kings of Israel. David married a Philistine or Canaanite princess. Solomon had not only an Egyptian king's daughter, but also princesses from Ammon and other neighbouring nations. Jezebel, however, was a more energetic personage than any of these. She made herself conspicuous by the ruthless way in which she urged Ahab to assert the royal power. In this way she made herself not only conspicuous but hated, and the hatred easily extended itself to all the measures associated with her name.

An example of her influence in the administration of affairs is the outrage upon Naboth. It is refreshing to find in an oriental monarchy a subject who is not altogether subservient to the wishes of his sovereign. Naboth was such a subject. When the king coveted his vineyard he sturdily refused to sell it—the family inheritance was too precious to be alienated. Ahab understood and perhaps valued the sturdy Israelite independence, though his vexation at the opposition was acute. At any rate, he saw no way to attain his desire in the face of refusal. But Jezebel had a different idea of royal prerogative. The Sheikhs of the town were subservient enough to act upon a hint from her. Naboth was arraigned and executed upon false witness suborned by them. The owner being thus put out of the way, it was easy to seize the coveted vineyard. Such methods were abhorrent to Israelite feeling, and this feeling was voiced by the prophet who sought out the king as he entered upon his new possession, and

¹ What is known of him may be found in Pietschmann, *Gesch. der Phönizier* (1889), p. 297 f.

to his face denounced his crime: "Hast thou murdered and robbed? In the place where the dogs licked up Naboth's blood shall they lick up thine also."¹ That the king was not hardened in his course is evident from his repentance which followed and which seems to have been openly expressed. To later generations, however, the blood of Naboth seemed to rest on the house of Omri, and the fall of the dynasty was interpreted as the divine requisition of that blood.

The marriage with Jezebel was doubtless intended to cement an alliance of the two kingdoms represented. Ahab was also on friendly terms with Judah. Very likely he was trying to strengthen himself against the Syrians of Damascus, his hereditary enemies.² Unfortunately we are not able to make out the course of events with any clearness. Twice during Ahab's reign the Syrians seem to have penetrated to the centre of Israel, and to have besieged the capital, but the final result was in favour of Israel. Ahab was not anxious to press his advantage and made an agreement with Benhadad, by which a quarter was to be set apart for Israelite traders in Damascus, and a similar concession was to be made to the Damascus merchants in Samaria. The pledges given were not kept by Benhadad, and Ahab went to war again with the help of Jehoshaphat, to force the promised surrender of Ramoth Gilead. This, however, was near the close of Ahab's life, and the whole Syrian controversy possibly belongs in the latter part of his reign.

Our sources give a large space to the life of Elijah the prophet, which comes within this reign. The activity of this extraordinary man is described to us in terms that show what impression he made on his contemporaries, rather than what he was in himself, and what he accomplished for Israel. The legendary accretions of the narrative are only too evident. Among its exaggerations we may count the assertion that Jezebel was an active persecutor of the religion of Yahweh. The statement that she slew all the prophets of Yahweh is inconsistent with the fact that Ahab maintained a band of four hundred court prophets, from whom he inquired the will of Yahweh. In a scene which we shall con-

¹ 1 Kings, 21¹⁹.

² Winckler supposes that Ahab was incited by Assyria in his hostility to Damascus. In fact, Assyria was beginning to take a lively interest in the affairs of Syria; cf. *Keilinschriften und Altes Test.*,³ pp. 43 and 166.

sider later, Jehoshaphat of Judah, who was certainly a faithful worshipper of Israel's God, was present, and had no suspicion that these were anything but genuine prophets of Yahweh. Micah, who is called in because of his independence of the court, does not intimate that the court prophets were devoted to any other God than his own, though he supposes them to be deceived.¹ The existence of such a body of Yahweh prophets at the capital at the very close of Ahab's life is incomprehensible if any serious attempt had been made to suppress the ancestral religion. To this must be added the significant fact that Ahab gave his children names compounded with that of Yahweh.² It may be doubted, moreover, whether Jehoshaphat would have made alliance and intermarriage with an avowed enemy of Israel's God.

Nevertheless, we must suppose that some sort of religious contest went on in Israel during Ahab's reign. The origin of it may also be attributed with some certainty to Jezebel. As Solomon's wives had their sanctuaries in which they might worship each her own god, so this queen had a temple of the Tyrian Baal erected at Samaria. This sanctuary received importance from the political alliance of Tyre and Israel. Whether the fact that Jezebel's father was a priest of Astarte increased her zeal for her own religion we cannot say. But it would not be surprising to find a priest's daughter industrious in adorning the religion she professed, in such a way as to make it attractive to her subjects. The officials at court would pay their respects to the Tyrian god for reasons of state. It would be natural for others to join them in seeking the advantages of a new religion. In this way a party of Baal worshippers was formed in the capital. They were not numerous even there, as we learn from their easy suppression by Jehu, and it is not likely that many were found in the provinces.

Political and religious opposition go together in the East. We

¹ It is evident that our account of Ahab is made up from at least two different sources, one of which painted him much blacker than he was. The account referred to above (1 Kings, 22¹⁻²⁸) is from the older source. On the literary questions the reader may consult Driver, *Literature of the Old Testament*, or the recent commentaries to Kings.

² The son who succeeded him was called Ahaziah (Yahweh is strong); the second son, who also came to the throne, was Jehoram (Yahweh is exalted); and the daughter who married Jehoshaphat was Athaliah (Yahweh is great[?]). Another son, Joash, is mentioned, whose name is of similar composition, though one element is of unknown meaning (1 Kings, 22²⁶).

cannot doubt that Elijah was a pronounced opponent of the foreign queen. His sympathy with the common people would lead him to denounce acts of oppression like the murder of Naboth. Denunciation of the imported religion and customs would naturally come next. And the Tyrian Baal, becoming the object of hatred, would involve the other Baals whose worship had already been adopted in Israel.

We have already had occasion to notice that Yahweh was originally the God of the desert, whose home was in Horeb, Sinai, or Kadesh. Horeb was still his main seat, even down to the writing of the life of Elijah. Although by the Ark, or by the Tabernacle, or in some way, He had been brought by the nomads into Canaan, He was not (in the mind of the Israelites) the God of the land. The land was in possession of numerous local divinities (Baals). Yahweh might dispossess these, as in some cases He dispossessed their worshippers. But, for the most part, the conquest was by amalgamation rather than by violence. Where alliances were formed with the older inhabitants their gods were recognised. The connubium (as was rightly seen by the Deuteronomist) involved the worship of the divinities of both parties. Moreover, it was the naïve idea of the desert peoples that the Baals would be better acquainted with agriculture than was their own God. It would be safer for the cultivator to look to them for the fruits of the ground. Israel's constant temptation would be to worship Yahweh and at the same time serve the other gods—as the Assyrian colonists were reproached with doing later. The tendency was reinforced by the greater attractiveness of the Canaanite sanctuaries. Here all the resources of the superior civilisation were brought into play to make the people “rejoice before their god.”

So far had this syncretism gone, that Yahweh and Baal had become practically identified in the minds of the people at large. This was easy, because the word Baal (Lord) could be applied to any God. One could say without offence that Yahweh was Israel's Baal. From this point of view, we can understand the use of the word Baal in Israelite proper names, where there is no thought of backsliding from the religion of Israel. Gideon was called by a name compounded with Baal. So was a son of Saul, and a grandson of his as well. David gave a similar name to at least one of his sons. In all these cases there can be no suspicion

of departure from the religion of Yahweh. Nevertheless, the confusion between Israel's Baal and the Baals of Canaan was dangerous in its tendency, likely to lead in the long run to the prevalence of the sensual and polytheistic religion of Canaan, and unless counteracted certain to result in the degradation of Yahweh to a place among a multitude of gods.

So far as we know, no protest came until the days of Ahab. Then it seems that the introduction of the Tyrian Baal led to more serious reflection on the nature of Yahweh, as contrasted with the nature of the Baals in general. The result was a reaction against the Canaanitish elements of the popular religion, in favour of the primitive and simple worship of the desert. No doubt this was, in part, a revolt against civilisation itself. The nomad, accustomed to privation, sees something abnormal in the luxuries of a wealthy society. He has reason to be shocked by the vices of the towns. The older society into which the Israelites had come was—in comparison with the desert life—both luxurious and vicious, and its religion partook of both characteristics. The prophets of a later time tell us plainly that the sanctuaries of the land were given over to feasting and drunkenness and gross sensuality.

In the time of Ahab we meet striking testimony to this reaction in the person of Jonadab ben Rechab. This man, who was chosen by Jehu to witness his zeal for the ancestral religion, was himself an embodiment of zeal on this behalf. He had laid upon his clan a solemn injunction to drink no wine, to build no house, to sow no seed, to plant and own no vineyard. They were to live the old nomad life in tents for ever.¹ Such a vow could have none but a religious motive, and the motive in this case must have been devotion to the ancestral religion, in opposition to Canaanitish innovations.

Elijah was the hero and leader of the reaction of which Jonadab was a symptom. Jonadab contented himself with the salvation of his own clan; Elijah preached the crusade among the people at large. From the meagre descriptions which have come down to us, we conclude that the prophet was a typical Bedawy—the man clothed in a blanket of hair. His native district was Gilead, a region where the Israelites longest retained the pastoral life. His sudden appearances and disappearances, and his long desert

¹ Jeremiah, 35¹⁻¹¹.

journeys, show the nomad's acquaintance with the country, its rocks and hiding places. His protest against the current religion is made known by his flight to Horeb—only here could he be sure of the effective protection of Israel's God. He believed that the Israelites, in forsaking their rude, primitive altars of unhewn stone, and in thronging the luxurious sanctuaries of Canaan, were really forsaking Yahweh. To call their new Baal by the old name of Yahweh did not diminish their guilt. His proclamation of the famine was a protest against the popular idea that Baal was the giver of fruitfulness. By withholding rain and mist, and making the judgments known to His prophet, Yahweh, God of Israel, showed who was master of the elements in His land. It was becoming plain that Israel could not serve two masters. For the first time, perhaps, it was borne home to them that Yahweh is a jealous God, who tolerates no rival in the affections of His people.

The legend-building imagination of later times has embodied Elijah's life-work in the scene at Mount Carmel, where the prophet stands alone against the four hundred prophets of Baal, and where the answer by fire brings the people back to their allegiance.¹ We cannot suppose the incident historical in the form in which it is narrated. After such a triumph we can find no reason for Elijah's flight to Horeb, or for the despairing cry there uttered, that he alone was left of the true servants of Yahweh. We may, however, suppose that the prophet's active opposition to Baal-worship, combined with his championship of the rights of the people against the tyranny of the queen² brought upon him the wrath of Jezebel, and that he was compelled to flee the country.

The weapons of this warfare were not exclusively spiritual. The separation of church and state is a modern and occidental idea. In an oriental society, the religious propaganda could not be separated from political machinations. We must, therefore, think of the prophetic party as political in their method and aims. This is plainly the view of our documents, for at Horeb,

¹ 1 Kings, 18.

² The prophet boldly confronted Ahab in the act of taking possession of his plunder and denounced his punishment as was noticed above. The difficulty the narrator found in making the events fulfil the prophecy is evidence of the genuineness of the prediction. He was obliged to assume that the fulfilment was postponed by Ahab's repentance, or to see a meagre accomplishment in the blood washed from the king's chariot.

where Elijah has fled for intimate communion with Yahweh, he receives the command to do—what? To anoint Jehu king over Israel, and Hazael king over Damascus, that is, to foment rebellion in both the kingdoms concerned. The injunction as it has come down to us is, indeed, a reflection of the actual course of history as seen by the later writer. But it is probably true to the facts in its conception of the prophetic programme and methods. Elisha, the intimate friend and disciple of Elijah, did encourage Jehu's rebellion, and we hear of no one who condemned the new king's drastic and cruel measures. The party of Elijah, therefore, was not made up of harmless religious enthusiasts. The prophetic guilds, of which we now hear again after a long interval, were hotbeds of sedition as well as homes of the contemplative life.¹

Were they homes of the contemplative life? Probably not. We understand under this term the quietism of the mystics. Convents of dervishes exist for stimulation of the religious emotions. These emotions easily become fanaticism. Too often, under the conviction of possessing the special favour of God, the members of these societies set themselves above the law, and plot the overthrow of dynasties. Their temper in the days of Ahab is made evident from an incident that has come down to us. In the course of the Syrian wars, Benhadad fell into the power of Ahab, and an honourable peace was concluded between them. A member of the prophetic order disguised himself as a soldier, and when the king went by called for justice. When allowed to state his case he pretended that he had been entrusted with a prisoner whom he had carelessly allowed to escape, so that the man for whom he had the prisoner in charge was now threatening his life. The king's decision was that the life was indeed forfeit, and this decision the prophet hastened to turn against the king himself.² The party of no compromise has never more completely revealed itself. In this case their policy of "thorough" could have no result except to embitter the feeling between the two nations. Political wisdom had no part in their programme. Their watchword was war to the knife against all foreigners, and the rigidity of their logic was proof against all considerations of expediency.

¹ On the prophetic guilds and Nazirites, cf. W. R. Smith, *The Prophets of Israel*,² p. 84 ff.

² 1 Kings, 20³⁵⁻⁴³,

The rank and file of the party doubtless show its worst features. Elijah appeals to us by the courage with which he contended against enormous odds. He was taken away before the coming of the revolution which he planned. We may be allowed to doubt whether he would have been satisfied with the way in which his party secured their triumph.¹ The later prophets did not hesitate to pronounce severe judgment on the bloodshed by which Jehu secured the throne.

In looking around for further light on the period now under review, we are at first inclined to make use of the memoirs of Elisha. But close consideration shows that they are, in large part, simply a duplication of those of Elijah. Historical material can scarcely be extracted from them. But from other sources we discover that events were preparing for Israel in a region of which Israel had little knowledge, and as yet no fear. The great kingdom of Assyria began now to threaten the coast-lands of the Mediterranean. We have already had occasion to notice the hold which Babylon had on Palestine in a very early time. During the period of the Hebrew invasion and conquest, the kingdoms of the Euphrates valley were busy elsewhere. Babylon had now taken the second place, having yielded to the greater vigour of Assyria, its northern neighbour, whose capital was Nineveh. Assyria, in the reign of Omri, was showing new strength, and beginning to turn its attention to the west. Assurnazirpal (B.C. 884-860) is described as the conqueror of the region from the Tigris to the Lebanon and the Great Sea. He himself boasts of an expedition in which he climbed the Lebanon, cleansed his weapons in the Great Sea, and received the tribute of Tyre and Sidon, with other cities of the region.² Israel seems to have lain outside the sphere of influence thus secured, though one would think that the experience of so near a neighbour as Tyre would have a lesson for the most thoughtless. The next Assyrian king, Shalmaneser II, came into contact with Ahab at the battle of Karkar, in northern Syria. Here the kingdoms of Syria and Palestine were united to resist the Assyrian advance. According to the inscriptions, the allied forces included twelve hundred

¹ An interesting article on Elijah (by Gunkel) may be found in the *Preussische Jahrbücher* for 1897, pp. 18-51.

² *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek*, pp. 95, 109. No Assyrian king had come so far to the west since Tiglath-pileser I, more than a hundred years earlier.

chariots, twelve hundred horsemen, and twenty thousand footmen of Hadadezer of Damascus, while Ahab is credited with two thousand chariots and ten thousand men.¹ The number of chariots seems incredible, but the Assyrian may exaggerate for his own glory. He claims a complete victory, but it is possible the result was so indecisive that the allies could deceive themselves into thinking they had warded off any immediate danger.

It has been supposed that Ahab sent his troops to Karkar as a vassal of Benhadad, in which case the battle must have preceded the defeat of Syria, and the treaty between the two kings already narrated. It is difficult to suppose, however, that Benhadad could compel the attendance of such an army as is ascribed to Ahab by the Assyrian inscription. It seems more probable that the treaty made between the two powers was an alliance, offensive and defensive, against the Assyrian. It must be admitted that few men in Israel were so far-sighted as to apprehend danger from the Euphrates kingdom. But Ahab seems to have had unusual political wisdom, and the fact that Tyre had been obliged to make concessions to the invaders was likely (owing to his intimacy with that city) to make a strong impression upon him. It can hardly be called unreasonable, therefore, to suppose that Ahab was the moving spirit in the alliance. After Karkar, Benhadad seems to have made some sort of arrangement with Assyria that left him free to carry on the old feud with Israel.

The bone of contention was Ramoth Gilead, a fortified town to which Israel had a title, but which Syria had in possession. Ahab had as his ally Jehoshaphat of Judah, his son-in-law. The council of state in which the two kings decided on the campaign is vividly described for us. The court prophets were unanimous in urging war. A certain Micaiah, who did not belong to their number, had a more gloomy outlook, but his prediction did not make any change in the king's determination. The reputation of Ahab for courage and ability is indicated by the orders given to the Syrian army—namely to make him the special object of attack. In the hope of avoiding his fate, the king disguised himself before going into battle. But a chance arrow found a vulnerable spot, and he met his death bravely fighting against the

¹ The detailed enumeration is given on the great monolith of Shalmaneser (*Keilinschr. Bibliothek*, I, p. 173). An annalistic inscription of the king **dates** the battle in the sixth year of his reign, that is, B.C. 854 (*ibid.*, p. 133 f.)

enemies of Israel. Disdaining to turn his back to the foe, he had his attendants support him in his chariot so long as the fighting continued. At sunset he died, and the body was brought home to Samaria for burial.

Ahab's son, Ahaziah, died after a short reign and was succeeded by his brother Joram. It was perhaps during his reign that the Syrians again besieged Samaria and reduced it to famine. The siege was lifted so suddenly that the Hebrews could only suppose a special intervention of divine power. The camp of the besiegers was found deserted, and their track was marked by the weapons and accoutrements which they had thrown away in their hasty retreat. The most natural hypothesis seemed to be that a panic had fallen upon them in which they heard the noise of an invading army; that they leaped to the conclusion that the Israelites had secured the help of the Hittites and Muçrites. As a matter of fact the retreat had another reason. A new Assyrian invasion threatened Damascus, and to meet this, all available forces must be gathered as soon as possible at the capital.

A renewed endeavour to regain Ramoth Gilead was made, while the Syrians were thus kept busy at home. In this campaign Joram was wounded, and was obliged to return to Jezreel. While there convalescing he was visited by his nephew Ahaziah, of Judah. The siege was continued under the direction of Jehu ben Nimshi, the general of the army.

The chronicle of petty wars is not complete without mention of the Moabite revolt. This nation (or tribe) which had been subdued by David had regained its independence under some of the later kings, but was again subdued by the energy of Omri.¹ It paid tribute to Omri and Ahab, but after Ahab's death (it would seem) it again revolted. From the confused account of the Hebrew text, we gather that Israel and Judah in conjunction invaded the country and besieged the capital. So great was the extremity that the Moabite king offered his first-born son as a sacrifice to his god. A reverse or calamity of some kind falling upon Israel soon after was regarded by both parties as a proof of the efficacy of the sacrifice, and Israel retreated from the land. Mesha, the hero of this incident, has left on record a testimonial to the help of Chemosh the national divinity. In this he con-

¹ It is possible that the poetical fragments now preserved in Num. 21^{14 f.}, 27-30 commemorate the wars of Omri.

fesses that Omri oppressed Israel a long time, "for Chemosh was angry with his land." The period of subjection is reckoned at forty years.¹ After its expiration Chemosh was again gracious, and with his help Moab threw off the oppressor's yoke. Mesha was able to carry the war into the enemy's country and conquer many of the cities of Israel. Some of these cities were "devoted" to Chemosh, and the god was permitted to feast his eyes upon the extermination of their inhabitants. This vivid statement from the hand of the chief actor in the tragedy reveals a state of things which the Hebrew historian prefers to pass over in silence.

Concerning Jehoshaphat the King of Judah, whose reign was for the most part contemporaneous with that of Ahab, there is little to say. The Hebrew historian commends him on the ground that he followed the example of Asa, his father.² This must mean that he reformed the cultus, and in fact it is added that he completed the purgation of the Temple by removing the remnant of the Temple prostitutes (*Kedeshîm*). Beyond this, the historian seems to know of the king's wars, though he does not relate them. He tells that Edom was subject, and that the king attempted to revive the Red Sea commerce, but without success. The earliest of our Hebrew sources seems not to have judged Jehoshaphat harshly for his alliance with Ahab—an alliance that was cemented by the marriage of the Judaite crown prince with Athaliah, Ahab's daughter. In this writer's eyes (we may conclude), Ahab was not an apostate from Yahweh.

The successors of Jehoshaphat are of no importance to the history. In the reign of Jehoram, Edom made its revolt good, and Libnah, a fortified town on the border, went over to the Philistines. Ahaziah, who came next to the throne, reigned but one year, and was then involved in the catastrophe which overtook the house of Omri.

¹ The number is wholly inconsistent with the data of the Hebrew text. The combined reigns of Omri and Ahab here cover thirty-four years. Mesha evidently makes the oppression begin after the accession of Omri, and end about the middle of Ahab's reign. Cf. the article "Chronology" in the *Encycl. Bib.*, I, p. 792, note, where a somewhat different translation is proposed. Cf. also Paton, *Early History of Syria*, p. 216, and *Die Inschrift des König's Mesa* by Smend and Socin.

² 1 Kings, 22⁴³. The Greek version inserts the paragraph, vv.⁴¹⁻⁵¹, after 16³⁸ because it makes the accession of Jehoshaphat precede that of Ahab.

CHAPTER XI

THE HOUSE OF JEHU

RAMOTH GILEAD¹ was still in question between the two kingdoms of Syria and Israel. Joram² ben Ahab had again besieged it, and when compelled by his wounds to retire to Jezreel, he left Jehu, his general, to carry on the siege. Some indications there are that the work was nearly done; perhaps the town itself was in the hands of Israel, the citadel alone remaining stubborn. The general was one day seated in council with his officers, when a young man, bearing the marks of travel, and labouring under the mental excitement that marked the members of the prophetic guild, entered the room. In response to his cry, "I have business for thee, O General!" Jehu asked which of them was meant, and, on being assured that he was the one concerned, took the young man into his private apartment. Without delay, the newcomer poured oil upon the head of the officer, with the declaration: "Thus saith Yahweh, God of Israel; I have anointed thee king over the people of Yahweh, over Israel." He then rushed out of the house and disappeared as suddenly as he had come.³

Jehu, interrogated by his comrades as to the errand of "this crazy fellow," attempted to pass it off as a mad freak only, but when pressed, he related what had actually taken place. The enthusiasm of the army for its general readily took up the cry, *Jehu is king*; a rude throne was extemporised at the head of a staircase, the trumpet was blown, and the new king received the congratulations and the allegiance of his soldiers. The energy

¹ This is the form of the name in the received Hebrew text; *Ramath* Gilead would be the more natural vocalisation. The locality is not yet certainly identified.

² The Hebrew text gives sometimes the longer form, Jehoram, and sometimes the shorter form, Joram, for the son of Jehoshaphat and also for the son of Ahab. I have retained one form for each monarch.

³ 2 Kings, 9¹⁻⁶. The verses which follow, and which command the extermination of Ahab's house, are a later expansion.

which had already made him famous marked him as the right man to head a revolution. That it was no sudden freak of a half-crazy journeyman prophet which put him on the throne we may well imagine. Tradition itself makes him to have been Elijah's candidate for the throne. Elisha's disciple did but fire a train that had long been laid by the party opposed to the house of Omri. The disability of the actual occupant of the throne gave opportunity for striking a long-meditated blow.

Jehu's character comes to view in the prompt measures he took to secure the throne. He first arranged that no news of the event should precede him.¹ With a small band of picked horsemen he then set out himself for Jezreel. All depended upon overpowering the wounded king before any force could be rallied to his support. Joram was informed by the watchman of the approaching troop, and sent out to know what it meant. But the messengers were not allowed to return. Unwilling to believe the worst, though evidently suspecting it, the king, with his nephew of Judah, drove out to meet the usurper. They met him near the vineyard whose possession had been fatal to Naboth. Ascertaining that it was indeed rebellion which they had to meet, the two kings turned to flee. But Jehu, with his own bow, sent an arrow into the heart of his sovereign. The king of Judah turned into the highway which led southward to En-gannim, hoping (if he had any definite hope) to escape to his own territory. He was followed by some of the soldiers and wounded. Finding the road to the south closed against him, he turned westward to Megiddo, and there died.²

Jehu had not followed Ahaziah, but, giving command to his adjutant to throw the body of Joram into the vineyard of Naboth, he himself proceeded to secure the palace. Jezebel, as queen-mother, had continued to rule the kingdom after the death of Ahab. Her death was even more necessary than the death of her son. She was not ignorant of what was going on and was doubtless aware that the hearts of the people were estranged from her. Nothing was left her except to meet death as a queen should

¹ "Let no fugitive go out of the city" (2 Kings, 9¹⁵) is an indication that the town, or at least a part of it, was in possession of the Israelites.

² This account assumes that Beth Haggan, of 2 Kings, 9²⁷, is identical with En-gannim. The Ascent of Gur, where Ahaziah was overtaken, has not been identified, but Ibleam, near which it is placed, lies a little south of Engannim.

meet it. So she arrayed herself in her royal robes, and from a window that commanded the palace gate, saluted the entering enemy. "Hail, thou Zimri, thou assassin!" was the cry that uttered all her scorn. Jehu could only reply:¹ "Who are you, to bandy words with me?" Then, as he saw the servants near her, he commanded them to pitch her headlong from the window. None seemed able to resist his will, and the eunuchs threw her down. Her blood spattered the wall, and her body was mangled by the hoofs of the plunging horses. Such was the end of the imperious Jezebel, daughter of kings, wife of a king, mother of kings. Her unscrupulous acts brought destruction upon herself and upon her children, but we can hardly refuse our tribute of admiration to the right royal way in which she met her fate.

According to our sources, the fulfilment of Elijah's prophecies against Jezebel and the house of Ahab was strikingly evident to Jehu himself. The new king probably regarded himself as the predestined instrument of the divine vengeance, having been prepared for his work by the prophetic preaching. There can be no doubt that he took himself seriously in the rôle thus assigned him. At his instigation the male members of the house of Ahab were mercilessly slaughtered at Samaria. The princes of Judah who were within his reach were also slain, probably because of their connexion with Ahab—the two houses were allied by marriage as we have just seen. The details of the massacre may be read in the Biblical narrative. Jehu's relations with the party of Old Israel are indicated by the account of his friendship with Jonadab ben Rechab.

The suppression of the worship of the Tyrian Baal was naturally one of the first steps taken by Jehu. One account describes the stratagem by which this was accomplished. It narrates how Jehu himself pretended to be a worshipper of Baal, and proclaimed a great feast to him at Samaria. The Temple area was filled with worshippers, and the sacred vestments were distributed to them all. Jehu offered the sacrifice with his own hands, and then the executioners were turned loose on the defenceless throng, and cut them down in cold blood to the last man. The sequel was the demolition of the sanctuary and the effective desecration of its site. The account can hardly be taken literally—it is a dramatic idealisation of what actually took place. Jehu could

¹ 2 Kings, 9³². Correct the text with Benzinger, *Handkommentar*, p. 152.

not, with any hope of success, take the part of a worshipper of Baal. He was known as the organ of the prophetic party; he had allied himself with the zealots too ostentatiously to play the hypocrite with any hope of success. His very insistence that *Ahab served Baal little, but Jehu will serve him much* would arouse the suspicions of the Baal party. But, though we cannot suppose such an artifice likely to be successful, we must believe that Jehu did put down the worship fostered by Jezebel, and that he put it down with a strong hand.

Jehu is mentioned by the Assyrian king, Shalmaneser II, as paying him tribute, along with the Tyrians and Sidonians. The Israelite king is called *Son of Omri*, which indicates that the revolution had not come to the knowledge of the court of Nineveh. This can hardly excite wonder in view of Israel's remoteness and insignificance. It is, perhaps, noteworthy that the tribute is spoken of in connexion with the invasion of Damascus, then under the rule of Hazael. The Assyrians claim to have defeated the opposing army at *Saniru*, in the Lebanon,¹ and to have shut Hazael in Damascus, whose environs they laid waste. From the fact that they did not take the capital we may conclude that the expedition was only partially successful. The tribute sent by Jehu may have been intended to secure Assyrian help against Hazael. In any case it created a dangerous precedent. The Assyrian king would regard it as a recognition of his overlordship. We may hold, also, that it was ineffectual in obtaining the help needed. Hazael was able to preserve his capital, and as soon as the Assyrian army was recalled, his hands were free to take vengeance upon his neighbours, and to recoup his losses by plundering their territory. From this point of view we may interpret the declaration of the Hebrew historian: "In those days Yahweh began to rage against Israel, and Hazael smote them—all the borders of Israel." The prophetic legend also throws light upon this period, when it makes Hazael a truculent enemy of Israel, who burned their fortresses, slew their young men, dashed the children against the wall, and ripped up the pregnant women.² Amos

¹ The name reminds us of *Senir*, one of the names for Hermon, Dt. 3⁹, or some part of the Antilebanon, 1 Chr. 5²³, Ezek. 27⁵, Cant. 4⁸. The Assyrian account is given in *Keilinschr. Bibliothek*, I, pp. 141-143.

² The detailed prediction of Hazael's cruelty is put into the mouth of Elisha, 2 Kings, 8¹². The verse quoted above about Yahweh's rage is 2 Kings, 10³²

looks back on this time of guerilla warfare when he denounces Damascus for threshing Gilead with iron threshing-sledges. The misery in Israel must have been extreme.

The mention of Jehu in the Assyrian inscriptions brings to our notice the chronological difficulties of the Hebrew record. Shalmaneser dates the battle of Karkar, at which Ahab was present, in the sixth year of his reign, and he received the tribute of Jehu in the eighteenth. Within the interval of twelve years we must find room for the two reigns between Ahab and Jehu. The Biblical data for these two reigns sum up fourteen years. The contradiction is obvious. On the theory that the Hebrew author counted fractions of years as full years, we might suppose that Ahaziah's two years only completed the year of his father's death and began the next, in which case his accession would fall in the year 853 B.C. But it is difficult to suppose that the campaign of Ramoth Gilead, in which Ahab lost his life, took place the same year with the severe losses of the battle of Karkar. In any case, the tribute of Jehu must have been sent soon after his accession. The year of his revolt would, therefore, be the year in which Shalmaneser mentions the tribute—842 B.C.¹ This may be regarded as the earliest date that we can fix with any considerable certainty in the history of Israel. From here we can reckon backward to the death of Solomon, which would occur about 930, and the accession of David would fall not far from the year 1000 B.C. But, until new sources are open to us, these figures can be only approximate.²

(emended text). To understand Amos' language (Amos, 1³) we must remember that the oriental threshing-sledge grinds the straw to bits, cf. Is. 41¹⁵.

¹ The inaccuracy of the Biblical numbers becomes more glaring, if we suppose, with Cheyne (*Encycl. Bibl.*, I, p. 92), that the defeat at Karkar fell in the three years' peace between Syria and Israel. On the whole subject the reader may consult the articles on "Chronology" in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, and in the *Encycl. Biblica*.

² Some sarcasm has been expended upon the scholars who are so anxious to convict the Biblical authors of error, while accepting the Assyrian statements without reserve. The case is very simple; the Assyrians had a regulated chronology and dated their documents by it. The Hebrews did not have such a chronology, and the data which have come down to us are inconsistent with each other, as well as with what we know from other sources. The most persistent attempts to defend the authenticity of the numbers in the books of Kings always end in hypotheses of textual corruption, or of omitted data—interregna or co-reigns—for which the text gives no warrant.

In the southern kingdom we find an interesting parallel to the rebellion of Jehu in the usurpation of Athaliah. This daughter of Ahab and Jezebel was now queen-mother, and therefore the most powerful person in the palace next to her son Ahaziah. Ahaziah, as we have seen, was murdered because of his relationship with Joram whom he was visiting in Jezreel. Other members of the royal family were visiting their cousins in Samaria and were included in the massacre that overtook the house of Ahab.¹ We do not know who had the next right to the throne of Judah. But we do know that his accession would have superseded the queen-mother, for to guard against losing her place she resolved on a step worthy of the daughter of Jezebel. So far as was in her power she completed the extermination of the house of David, and in default of any other claimant, herself ascended the throne. For six years she presented to Judah the unusual spectacle of a woman wielding the supreme power.

The fall of the woman was made possible by the foresight of a woman. Jehosheba, sister of the late king (but hardly a daughter of Athaliah, we may suppose), saved her nephew Jehoash from the fate of his uncles, brothers, and cousins. Her ability to protect him was given by the fact that she was wife of Jehoiada, the priest who had charge of the Temple. With her husband she seems to have had apartments within the sacred enclosure. Here the lad found an asylum until such time as he might be proclaimed king. The priest thought it unsafe to wait longer than six years, at the expiration of which time the boy king was only seven years of age.

Jehoiada's dependence was on the royal body-guard. As we have already noticed, the Temple was in a separate court immediately adjoining the royal residence and was a part of the same group of buildings with it. The body-guard was organised in three divisions, an arrangement as old as the time of David. The standing order was that on week days two companies should be on duty in the palace and one in the Temple, but that on the Sabbath, when the Temple was most frequented, the proportion should be reversed. Moreover, on that day the posts were shifted; the company that had been on duty at the Temple then took its station at the palace. Jehoiada having found means to secure the support of the officers, arranged that, on the particular

¹ They were forty-two in number according to 2 Kings, 10¹⁴.

Sabbath which he fixed upon, the soldiers already in the Temple should be detained beyond the usual hour. The consequence was that on the arrival of the other two companies from the palace, the whole band was united at the Temple, and the palace was left wholly without a guard. When this was accomplished, the young king was brought out, anointed, and crowned.¹ The soldiers greeted him with acclamations, and taking him in the midst they marched to the palace. The death of the queen was the logical sequel.

We have no means of knowing how far religious motives were active in this counter-revolution. It would be rather strange if religious motives were not active in it. The daughter of Jezebel may be suspected of being an innovator like her mother. In this case the hands of Jehoiada were strengthened by the conservatives. But on the face of it the account shows only an ordinary palace revolution. The statements concerning the destruction of a temple of Baal, and concerning a covenant with Yahweh entered into by the king and people, are later insertions into the text.²

The lad upon whom greatness was thus thrust had a lively sense of gratitude toward his guardian, and we may well suppose that Jehoiada was the virtual ruler for many years. The paucity of our information concerning matters of state, however, continues throughout this period. All that the historian has thought worthy of preservation is an extract from the Temple history. This extract relates a dispute concerning the priests' responsibility for the repair of the sanctuary. The matter is not entirely clear to us, but we may imagine something as follows: The Temple was the royal chapel. At first the Temple treasure was part of the king's property; the income from gifts and fines belonged to the monarch. When this was the case the priests, as royal officers, received their support from the palace. But the area of perquisite is constantly extending. The priests would easily claim that the offerings should belong to them as persons specially

¹ According to a plausible emendation of the text, he also received the royal bracelet—such we find among the insignia of Saul. On the composite nature of the account, 2 Kings, 11 4-20, see the commentaries of Kittel and Benzinger.

² This is pointed out by Stade, *Zeitsch. f. d. Alttest Wissensch.* V, p. 283, f., and admitted by Kittel, though he thinks the difference of age not very great.

consecrated. Logically the fines which were imposed for neglected religious duties would follow the same course. If the animal that was vowed to the sanctuary belonged to the priests, the money which was received as its equivalent would equally belong to them. By the time of Jehoash a custom had become established which gave the priests a right to all these sources of income. At the same time, the priests felt no responsibility for the repair of the sanctuary—*that* belonged to the king. Jehoash was willing explicitly to sanction the custom, but in return for the legitimation he sought to lay some responsibility on the party benefited. He allowed the priests to receive “the money of the sacred things,” but stipulated that they should keep the House in repair.

The result was what we might expect. The priests were willing to receive the money as their right, but the duty of repairing the house was still regarded by them as devolving on the royal treasury. After some friction between the two parties, a new arrangement was made. The money which was exacted in connexion with the trespass offerings and sin offerings was given to the priests without drawback. For what else came into the Temple treasury a special chest was provided. When a considerable amount had accumulated, the king's chancellor came and counted it, and provided for the repairs in question. This is not the only time that laymen have shown greater zeal and fidelity in sacred things than have the men to whom the responsibility would more naturally belong. As it was the twenty-third year of Jehoash when the neglected state of the Temple caused this discussion, its lack of repair can hardly be laid to the charge of Athaliah.¹

The incident shows that Jehoash was able to release himself from his subserviency to Jehoiada. It shows also a tendency, which became more marked as time went on—the tendency of the Temple officers to organise as a close corporation, which should have revenues and privileges of its own. The rest of the acts of Jehoash are left unrecorded, except the forced contribution which he made to Hazael, king of Damascus. The Syrian was now at the height of his power. Shalmaneser had again invaded his territory, but without effectively weakening his resources.² Since

¹ 2 Kings, 12 4-16.

² In his twenty-first year he claims to have taken four cities from Hazael, *Keilinsch. Bibliothek*, I, p. 143.

this time Shalmaneser had been kept at home by a rebellion there. His son Shamsiramman had to meet a general revolt of the provinces, and to reconquer a large part of his empire. It was not till the reign of the next king, Ramman-nirari III, that Damascus suffered from the Assyrian attack. Hazael had practically a free hand during his whole life, and he made use of his opportunity by pressing Israel to the wall. Even Judah was at his mercy, as is indicated by what has already been said.¹

Turning now to the northern kingdom, we see the situation as it had been in the time of Jehu becoming worse under his son Jehoahaz. "The wrath of Yahweh was hot against Israel, and he gave them into the hand of Hazael, king of Syria, and into the hand of Benhadad, his son."² After an interpolation we read that the Syrian "left to Jehoahaz only fifty horsemen, and ten chariots, and ten thousand footmen; for the king of Syria had destroyed them and made them like dust of the threshing." For the time being the triumph of Damascus was complete.

The leaf was soon turned, but Jehoash did not live to see it. He was slain by a conspiracy of his officers. Just before his death another Jehoash had come to the throne in Samaria, and he was permitted to see some relief. The prophetic legend sets this before us in its anecdote of the end of Elisha. The aged prophet was on his death-bed when he was visited by the young king, who regarded him as the "chariot of Israel and its horsemen."³ The ruling passion roused the dying man, and he instructed the king to shoot an arrow out of the window toward Damascus—a type and promise of the deliverance to come. Three victories were promised, and it is intimated that more might have been gained had only the king shown sufficient zeal in the cause of freedom. Damascus, in fact, had its hands full in

¹ 2 Kings, 12¹⁸. If Hazael was able to carry his arms successfully as far as Gath, and even to threaten Jerusalem, his power was greater than that of any of his predecessors.

² 2 Kings, 13³. This Benhadad must be the king called Mari (Lord) in the Assyrian inscriptions; according to these, he was obliged to pay an enormous tribute to Assyria; *Keilinsch. Bibliothek*, I, p. 191.

³ "One blast upon his bugle-horn was worth ten thousand men" is the modern equivalent for this saying. We can readily suppose that Elisha had been the encourager of the royal house in the time of calamity.

another direction. Ramman-nirari was ready to enforce the slumbering Assyrian claims on the whole Mediterranean district. He invaded the west with an irresistible force. He boasts of bringing to his feet Tyre, Sidon, *the land of Omri*, Edom, Philistia—"the west land in all its extent." The special object of the expedition was Damascus, which had long-standing arrears. The city preferred not to risk a siege, and opened its gates to the invader. It was spared the horrors of sack, but its resources must have been heavily taxed to pay the tribute exacted.¹ The kingdom of Israel also paid tribute, but received an equivalent in the humiliation of its hereditary enemy. We may suppose that at this time Jehoash obtained the three promised victories, and recovered some of the cities which Israel had lost. That he was able to restore the ancient boundaries of his kingdom is not indicated by the narrative.

The relations of the two Israelite kingdoms at this date are vividly portrayed in the incident next narrated by the book of Kings. Jehoash of Judah had been succeeded by Amaziah, his son, an energetic prince who carried war into Edom. This prince took an important fortress called the Rock, which has sometimes been identified with Petra the capital—but this can hardly be correct.² Elated by his success the king sent a challenge to Jehoash of Israel. Cause of war there seems to have been none, unless Israel claimed the suzerainty over Judah.³ The good-natured contempt of Jehoash is indicated by his reply: "The thistle sent to the cedar saying: Give thy daughter to my son to wife; but a wild beast trod down the thistle." Such an answer was little calculated to preserve the peace. The two little kingdoms went to war, and the result justified the pride of Jehoash. Amaziah was defeated, and himself fell into the hands of the enemy. Either to give an example or to discourage assertions of independence, the victor broke down the wall of Jerusa-

¹ The king specifies 2,300 talents of silver, 20 talents of gold, 3,000 talents of copper, 5,000 of iron, besides stuffs, ivory furniture, and other property. *Keilinsch. Bibliothek*, I, p. 191.

² The rock of Kadesh has more claims, and is advocated by Cheyne. Edom had revolted from Judah in the time of Jehoram, as we saw above.

³ The non-mention of Judah among the tributaries of Assyria when the more remote Edom is included in the list, would indicate that Judah was included in Israel. In this case Jehoash was making an effort for independence.

lem and looted the Temple and palace. Hostages also were demanded and granted, and carried back into Samaria.¹

The increasing prosperity of Israel continued into the next reign—that of Jeroboam II. The Hebrew historian gives only a brief statement, but one that is sufficiently positive: “He restored the territory of Israel from the Entrance of Hamath to the Sea of the Arabah.”² If this be so, and if Judah were really tributary to Israel, Jeroboam had possession of the whole extent of Canaan. The continued debility of Damascus allowed Jeroboam thus to extend his rule, though we must accuse the Hebrew writer of exaggeration when he gives him possession both of Damascus and of Hamath.³

The forty-one years of Jeroboam’s reign are dismissed in seven verses of the Hebrew historian’s text; of which four are taken up with the standing formulæ which are used at the beginning and end of each reign. The writer’s lack of interest in what we call history could not be more conspicuously shown. All that we have is the bare mention of Jeroboam’s success in war. Yet this success must have been purchased by a long and bloody conflict, marked by many stirring incidents such as the memory of Israel would cherish with pride or pathos. If a plausible interpretation of a verse in Amos may be trusted, the inhabitants of Samaria were ready to boast of their success in the capture of Lodebar and Karnaim from the Syrian enemy.⁴ Whatever further exploits of this kind there may have been are lost to us forever. The internal condition of the kingdom, however, has a strong light thrown upon it by the book of the prophet Amos. This remarkable man deserves our careful attention.

It has already been shown that a prophetic party in opposition

¹ The history of Amaziah (2 Kings, 14¹⁻¹⁴) also mentions as a remarkable fact, that he did not slay the children of his father’s assassins for the crime of their fathers. The story of the contest with Jehoash seems to come from a source unfriendly to Amaziah.

² 2 Kings, 14²⁵. The Entrance of Hamath was some town or fortress in the mouth of the valley which divides the two Lebanon ranges. The Sea of the Arabah is, of course, the Dead Sea.

³ 2 Kings, 14²⁸. The verse is a part of the redactor’s work, and as it stands is disfigured by an unintelligible reference to Judah.

⁴ Amos, 6¹³: “Who rejoice over Lodebar and who say: Have we not taken Karnaim by our own strength?”—the translation is attributed to Grätz by Wellhausen, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, V, p. 86. Lodebar and Karnaim were towns in Gilead.

to the house of Omri had been led by Elijah and afterward by Elisha. Their policy had been to overthrow the worship of the Tyrian Baal and to purge the religion of Yahweh of Canaanitish elements. Their success in putting Jehu upon the throne had only revealed the need of other reforms. Reflecting men, moreover, had learned that the cause of true religion was very little advanced by political measures. There were those who already hoped that the pen would prove mightier than the sword. A considerable literary activity developed in both kingdoms during the reign of Jehu and his successors. A part of this activity, if we may judge from the fragments that have come down to us, aimed to lead the thoughts of the people toward religious purification and improvement.

We may put here the memoirs of Elijah himself. For it could not have been long after his death that his admirers put their opinions of him into written form. The legendary exaggerations of the narrative are precisely such as attach themselves to the life-story of a saint within a very few years after his death. The extravagant esteem in which the man of God is held in the East is here painted to the life. We see the hero able to announce the famine predetermined by Yahweh, and himself miraculously nourished during its continuance. At his prayer the dead son of his hostess is restored to life. With the courage of one who knows his God to be with him, he faces the king who has vowed his destruction. Single-handed he stands against the prophets of Baal and brings them to confusion by the fire which consumes his sacrifice. At the close of his life he is miraculously carried away by a fiery chariot, doubtless to enjoy the pleasures of the paradise of God.¹ In all this we discover a book of edification, designed to commend to the people the cause of which Elijah was the champion. The biography of Elisha is so similar that we must suppose it to have taken shape at about the same time.

Far less political bias is shown by the poem which has come down to us under the title of *The Blessing of Moses*.² Here we see a lover of Israel describing the different tribes; praying that Judah may be brought into political unity with his brethren, praising the priestly prerogatives of Levi, breaking out into rap-

¹ The life of Elijah and Elisha is one of the chief sources for the book of Kings, 1 Kings, 17-19, 21; 2 Kings, 1-9.

² Inserted in Deuteronomy as Chapter 33.

tures over the fruitfulness of Joseph. The satisfaction of the poem with the present situation of Israel is in accord with the popular sentiment of the times. The author is not conscious of any breach between Israel and Yahweh, and assumes that the people are sure of the help of their God for all time to come. The confidence which is here expressed in noble form, was the very confidence that Amos was compelled to denounce.

In this period also we may place that elaboration of ancestral tradition which we call the Yahwistic element of the Pentateuch¹ (J). The writer collects the scattered stories of the creation, the deluge, the patriarchs and the exodus, and rewrites them in a connected narrative. His object, no doubt, is both literary and religious—he delights in putting the story into form for its own sake, but he is also anxious to teach a lesson. That lesson is the power of Yahweh and the favour which He has continually shown to Israel. Yahweh is the Creator of the land of Canaan. It is He who has been worshipped from the time of Enoch. It is He who promised Abraham possession of the land, and to whom Abraham erected altars in his sojourning. The ancient sanctuaries are dwelt upon with loving interest as places consecrated by the Patriarchs. The sojourn in Egypt and the exodus are made to give renewed evidence of Yahweh's favour. The conclusion of the whole matter seems to be: Fear Yahweh and keep His commandments. By thus showing the people the reasons for their worship, the author hopes to persuade them to that fidelity which Elijah would enforce by sterner measures.

What the author means by the service of Yahweh is revealed to us by his Decalogue, which we have already quoted.² This decalogue is essentially ritual. It forbids the making of molten gods, in which prohibition we may see the beginning of a reaction against the bulls of Jeroboam I. It commands the observance of the religious festivals, which are also the agricultural festivals. The firstlings and first fruits are to belong to Yahweh. Leavened bread is not to be brought to the altar, and the superstitious rite of boiling a kid with its mother's milk is prohibited.

¹ Cf. what was said above, pp. 12-15, 41-45. The book of J, like almost all Hebrew literature, went through various editions before being united with E. I assume that it was substantially complete in the present period, some little time before Amos.

² Above p. 68 f. The text of the Decalogue is taken from Ex. 34.

On the ground of such observances Yahweh made His covenant with Israel, and we can hardly help feeling that this author, with all his religious earnestness, encouraged the blindness against which Amos made such an energetic protest. Conscious opposition to the popular religion can scarcely be attributed to J.

Very different was Amos: He was not a literary man, though his book begins a new stage in the literature of Israel. He was a prophet—not one of the professed prophets, members of the guilds, but a man on fire with a message. A native of Judah, and a herdsman by occupation, he had felt the divine impulse, and left his herds and home to preach to Israel. The burden of his message was impending calamity. He saw that the long-suffering of Yahweh was exhausted. Twice had the judgment seemed about to fall, and twice it had been mercifully restrained. But now, this third time, Yahweh was testing Israel as one tests a wall with the plumb-line. The result could not be doubtful—Israel fell so far short of the requirements that judgment was sure to come: “The high places of Isaac shall be destroyed, and the sanctuaries of Israel shall be laid waste, and I will stand against the house of Jeroboam with the sword.”¹

With such a message, the prophet appeared at the ancient sanctuary of Bethel. The time was probably one of the stated festivals when the people were assembled in numbers. The presiding priest, as we should expect, saw treason in the denunciation of the reigning monarch. The activity of the prophetic order against the house of Omri was not forgotten. The royal official saw in Amos one of the wandering dervishes who went through the land raving out incoherent messages, expecting to receive his support at the hands of pious or superstitious citizens. He therefore gave information to the king, at the same time warning Amos that he would better ply his trade in Judah. But the preacher denies that he is a prophet by trade. All his life he had been a herdsman and a gatherer of sycamore figs. Just now he has a message from Yahweh—“when the lion roars who will not fear, when Yahweh speaks who will not prophesy?” Yahweh

¹ Amos, 7⁹. It seems not too daring to assume that this vision of the locusts, the fire, and the plummet was the opening of Amos's activity. The parallel cases of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel make this probable, and there is no reason to suppose that the discourses were written down in the order of their delivery.

had spoken, and the content of his message was: "Israel is ripe for destruction."¹

So much information is given us by the prophet concerning himself. His book makes the impression of an activity extended over some time. We have reason to be grateful that he put the outline of his discourses into written form. The message he has recorded is a very simple one. It may be summed up in the words: Israel is to be destroyed for its disobedience to Yahweh. And we are not left in doubt as to the method of destruction. War, with its concomitant horrors of pestilence and famine, is to come upon the country. The cities are to be sacked, the men are to be slain, the women and children are to go into captivity. As we may judge from what we have seen of literature in the period, this was a new sort of preaching to be delivered in the name of Yahweh. The people at large identified the cause of Yahweh and the cause of Israel. They could not conceive that He would deliver His people over to the enemy—what would become of Yahweh Himself? This is the question which the astonished hearers would put to the preacher.

The wrath of Yahweh was not, indeed, an unknown thing. At different times in the past He had been offended with His people; on occasion He had, for a while, left them to themselves, or even actively taken part against them. They had suffered defeat, oppression, visitations of various kinds. But sooner or later He had been appeased. He had always come to realise that they were His people; had turned to them, and had intervened for their deliverance. Yahweh was a man of war. There had always been a Day of Yahweh in which He had gone out at the head of His people, and had smitten their enemies. These days of victory were only precursors of a still greater Day of Yahweh in which He would again, and finally, vindicate them against every opposer.

This was the substance of the popular theology. It was evidently based upon the covenant relation so dear to the current tradition. It interpreted recent history in the light of this tradition and of its own desires. The defeat of the Syrians and the renewed prosperity of Israel were acts of God, evidences that

¹ Amos, 8^{1f}. The vision of the ripe fruit gives us one of those plays upon words of which the prophets were fond. Amos sees a basket of ripe fruit (*Kaiç*) and is told that the end (*Kēç*) has come upon Israel.

He was favourable to His land. How could it be otherwise? He Himself partook of the prosperity. His altars were now abundantly provided with sacrifices. The great festivals were celebrated more lavishly than ever before; the fat of fed beasts ascended continually to His grateful nostrils; tithes and free-will offerings were brought generously to His sanctuaries. The people could not conceive of anything more harmonious than their relation to their God, and they found every reason to hope in His continued approbation.

Against this whole structure of confidence Amos threw himself with an earnestness that may be called desperate. First of all, he took a broader view of Yahweh. Yahweh was to him much more than the God of Israel—He was the God of the nations. He had, indeed, brought Israel from Egypt, but He had also brought the Philistines from Caphtor, and the Syrians from Kir. One passage goes so far as to affirm that Nubians and Israelites were alike in His estimation. Yet this seems more than the sober reflection of the prophet would assert, for he does, in fact, recognise that Israel's relation to Yahweh is in some sense peculiar. But this rather increases the seriousness of the situation. Yahweh's choice of Israel has brought upon Israel greater responsibility: "You only have I known of all the families of the earth, *therefore* will I visit upon you all your iniquities."¹ The intimate relation between Yahweh and Israel is a reason why He should be more strict with them; their nearness made it impossible for Him to overlook their deficiencies.

The all-important question, therefore, is whether Israel has in fact obeyed the will of Yahweh. To this question Amos answers with an unequivocal No! And the answer is based upon two propositions. The first is that what Yahweh desires is not the cultus. It is irrelevant to the question between Him and His people. If men crowd the great sanctuaries bringing their offerings and tithes; if they sacrifice their thank-offerings and loudly invite guests to partake of their free-will offerings, it is because they love to have it so—not because He commands it. "I hate, I reject, your feasts, and I find no fragrance in your solemn assemblies; when you bring burnt-offerings I am not pleased, and I will not look upon your rich peace-offerings; remove from me

¹ Chapter 3². The declaration concerning Philistines, Syrians, and Nubians is found in 9¹.

the noise of your songs; I do not listen to the music of your harps." ¹ So true is this in the mind of the prophet that he does not hesitate to appeal to history: "Was it sacrifices and offerings that you brought me in the Wilderness forty years, O House of Israel?" The emphatic question certainly requires a negative answer.² It shows the same conception of history which we find in both Hosea and Jeremiah, according to which the wilderness wandering was a time when no sacrifices were brought. And yet it was a time of undisturbed affection between Yahweh and His people. The conclusion is plain—the luxuriant worship on which the people rely as their security can have no real effect upon the mind of Yahweh. He is estranged, and if there is nothing done except to continue the elaborate ritual He will remain estranged from Israel.

So far the negative side. Now comes the affirmation of the real reason; the anger of Yahweh was roused because of the moral corruption of His people. Their outward prosperity had been appropriated by the leaders, and had not been allowed to reach the common people. The nobles and governors had no regard for their poorer brethren. Oppression and extortion were the order of the day. The wealthy landowners in selling the necessities of life, exacted the utmost that the traffic would bear. The middlemen cheated both in the measure and in the quality of the grain. The nobles sold justice to the highest bidder. And while the poor were thus ground down, the rich dissipated their lives in feasting. The feasting was, to be sure, carried on in the name of religion. But it was none the better for that. The altar by whose side the upper classes drank themselves drunk, could exercise no purifying influence on such worshippers. The very garments on which the feasters lay witnessed against them, for they were garments of the poor, taken as pledges of usurious loans. The worship itself was infected—could drunkenness, gormandising, fornication, constitute the service of Yahweh?

Most fatal of all, perhaps, was the blindness which refused to see that calamity was impending: "Woe to them that are at

¹ Chapter 5 ¹¹ f., cf. 4 ⁴ f.

² I am aware of Professor Macdonald's ingenious discussion of this verse (5 ²⁵), *Journ. of Bib. Lit.* (1899), p. 214 f. But I still think the above the most natural translation. The next following verse (5 ²⁶) apparently once contained a similar question, cf. Schmidt, *ibid.* (1894), pp. 1-15.

ease in Zion, and secure in the mountain of Samaria . . . who put the evil day far away and yet bring near the régime of violence; who lie on couches of ivory, and stretch themselves on their beds; who eat lambs of the flock and calves from the stall; who thrum on the harp and improvise songs like David; who drink bumpers of wine and anoint themselves with the choicest perfume—but *they are not grieved at the impending doom of Joseph.*"¹ To arouse the people thus in false security is the first duty of the prophet.

Amos's standard of right and wrong is not applied to Israel alone. This is strikingly brought out by the first discourse in the book—which is also the most finished specimen of his oratory. From it we learn that Yahweh is offended by the sins of other nations, and that they are to suffer as well as Israel. The sins of which they are accused, however, are not sins of religion. There is no accusation of idolatry or polytheism, as though they had apostatised after receiving a primitive revelation of the true God. Their crime is violation of the common dictates of humanity. Damascus has threshed Gilead with iron threshing-sledges, grinding it down with perpetual warfare. Gaza has engaged in the slave trade, selling men in herds to the Arabian markets. Ammon has ripped up the pregnant women of Gilead in the wanton cruelty of its raids, and in the ambition of mere territorial extension. Moab has violated natural sentiment in burning the bones of the King of Edom to lime. A threefold, yes, fourfold, burden of guilt rests upon all these nations, and it is too late for a reprieve.

We can imagine the inner satisfaction with which the hearers, up to this point of the discourse, listened to Amos's denunciations. Damascus, Philistia, Ammon, Moab, these were their hereditary enemies. It could be only a gratification to learn that the wrath of Yahweh was kindled against them, and that their punishment was certain. But what must have been their revulsion of feeling when at the climax of the discourse, Israel ~~was~~ attacked in terms more scathing than those which had been employed for any of the others; when it appeared that Damascus and the others had been mentioned only to prepare the way for the rebuke of the chosen people!

¹ Amos, 6 1-6. I have omitted one obscure clause, as well as an interpolated verse. It is doubtful whether *Zion* is original in the opening clause—*Ephraim* or *Israel* is what we expect.

“Thus saith Yahweh : For the threefold, yes, fourfold, guilt of Israel I cannot hold back its sentence ; because they have sold the righteous for money, and the needy for a pair of shoes ; they crush the head of the poor into the dust, and thrust the lowly into the pit ; a man and his father go to the harlot¹ to profane my name ; on garments taken in pledge they stretch themselves by the side of every altar ; wine extorted in fines they drink in the house of their God. Yet I destroyed before them the Amorite, tall as the cedars and strong as the oaks ; I destroyed their fruit above, and their roots beneath ; and I brought you up from Egypt and led you forty years in the Wilderness, to possess the Amorites’ land ; and I raised up prophets of your sons and Nazirites of your young men—is not this true, Sons of Israel ? saith Yahweh. But you made the Nazirites drink wine, and commanded the prophets not to prophesy. Behold, I will make the ground rock beneath your feet, as the wagon sways under its load of sheaves ; and flight shall be cut off from the swift, and the strong shall not show his strength, nor the warrior save his life.”²

The old phrase, the Day of Yahweh, which Amos often heard from his contemporaries, received from him a new meaning in accordance with this conception of the divine purpose. There was to be such a Day—a time of direct intervention in the affairs of men. But it would not be a day of deliverance. Those who dream of it as the dawn of a millennium are deceiving themselves. “Alas for those who are longing for the Day of Yahweh ! What good is the Day of Yahweh to you ? It is darkness and not light—as if one should flee from a lion and meet a bear, or come into the house, and lean upon the wall and be bitten by a serpent. Is not the Day of Yahweh darkness instead of light, and gloomy without a single ray of brightness ? ”³ With this new interpretation of the Day, Amos opened the way to a long series of prophetic anticipations of a great Day of Judgment for the nations.

The working of the prophetic soul which here reveals itself, is,

¹ The slave consecrated to impure rites at the sanctuary is intended.

² Chapters 1 and 2 form a single discourse in strophical form. The latest study of it is by Löhr, *Untersuchungen zum Buch Amos* (1901).

³ Amos, 5¹⁸⁻²⁰. For a recent discussion on the Day of Yahweh, the reader is referred to the *Am. Journal of Theol.* for July, 1901.

in spite of the length of time by which it is separated from us, not only fully intelligible, but also sympathetic. To read history in the light of conscience is what all great thinkers have tried to do. The great fact which loomed up in Amos' political field of vision was the coming Assyrian invasion. The great world-power was like a black storm-cloud on the horizon. The common people or even the nobles might ignore it. They might suppose that with the humiliation of Damascus, the Great King had reached the limit of his power, and that they themselves were beyond the reach of his arm. Amos could not so judge. His intuition showed him that such a power is always extending its boundaries; that the going on to new conquests is a condition of life to it; that for it to stop advance is to bring on a crisis. I do not mean that the prophet distinctly formulated to himself a law of growth and decline of great empires. But he had a vague conception of such a law, and a very distinct conception of its concrete application in the case before him. Where Damascus, Tyre, Philistia had succumbed, it was not likely that Israel would escape. In the nature of things there was no reason why the Assyrian armies should spare Samaria. All that could save the people of Yahweh was a special intervention of Yahweh Himself. Had Israel any reason to hope for such a special intervention? Amos in all honesty could find no such ground. An essential condition for intervention must be conformity to the will of Yahweh. But this was what was conspicuously lacking. Moral corruption, disobedience to the plain demands of conscience, man's inhumanity to man, deadness to moral issues—these were features of the situation that stared him in the face. Hence his almost despairing denunciation of punishment. Only once does he intimate the possibility that it is not too late: "Hate evil and love good, and establish justice in the gate; *perchance* Yahweh, God of Israel, may pity the remnant of Joseph."¹ Elsewhere he treats the doom of his people as certain.

Pessimistic preachers rarely find a hearing. The preaching of

¹ Amos, 5³. As the book now stands it concludes with a paragraph of encouragement (9¹¹⁻¹⁵). But this is by many critics held to be the work of a later hand. The passage as it stands concerns itself with things in which Amos elsewhere shows no special interest—the ruined house of David, Israel's possession of Edom, the replanting of the people on the land from which they have been pulled up. Of course it is possible that an original hope of Amos has here been expanded, but I see no evidence of it.

Amos was a testimony against the vices of the times. On those who first heard it, it had little effect. All the more striking was its impression upon succeeding generations of preachers as well as readers. For our present purpose its value is in the light it throws upon the times of Jeroboam II. Making due allowance for the one-sided view which the prophet presents, we yet see that the reign so brilliant externally, was in no sense the beginning of a new era. Israel was socially and morally corrupt. The renewal of prosperity brought no renovation of the moral forces of the nation. Amos was right in his forecast of the future. The Assyrian storm-cloud was, in fact, gathering on the horizon. In a little while it must break upon Israel and must work complete destruction.

CHAPTER XII

THE FALL OF SAMARIA

THE reign of Jeroboam II showed the energy of the people, but it was the convulsive energy of a man in a fever. The reaction began with the death of the king, or even earlier. His son Zechariah came to the throne, but reigned only six months before his murder by Shallum. Shallum enjoyed the ill-gotten throne but one month before he was in turn murdered by Menahem, one of the generals. Civil war raged, and the ancient capital, Tirzah, was besieged and sacked by Menahem.¹ The reign of this king lasted ten years, but not without conflict, if we may judge from the fact that he bought the help of Tiglath-pileser by an enormous tribute. The period was, in fact, a period of anarchy. Before looking at it more closely, we must consider two literary monuments which belong in the closing years of Jeroboam II, or in the brief reigns which follow.

The first of these is the work of the historian whom we have called E, who treated from his own point of view the same material used by J, and whose writing was afterward combined with that of his predecessor. We can readily understand how a gentle spirit may seek consolation for the sad state of things around him in contemplating earlier and happier generations. Our author is one of the earliest examples of those who thus seek consolation. That his purpose is also hortatory is evident; he will hold up the examples of the Patriarchs and testify of the goodness of God to Israel. Ignoring the primeval history, he therefore begins with the call to Abraham. The Patriarch is presented as a prophet and intercessor, as well as the father of the chosen people. In contrast with the warlike aggression of later generations is the peaceful method in which Abraham obtains a foothold in the land, entering into covenant with the Philistines.

In conscious or unconscious opposition to Amos, this author lays emphasis upon the ritual side of religion. The sanctuary at

¹ 2 Kings, 15¹⁶, where Tirzah should probably be read instead of Tiphseh (Stade in the *Zeitsch. f. d. Alttest. Wissensch.*, VI, p. 159 f.).

Bethel seems especially dear to him, for he relates, with evident interest, the story of its founding by Jacob. It is his view (as well as that of his hero) that here is the house of God and the gate of heaven. The *maçseba* set up by Jacob is still the sacred object in the sanctuary, and the vow of Jacob sets the precedent for the tithes which Amos treats with such contempt. In regard to the *maçseboth*, the author is more nearly a representative of the popular religion than is his predecessor, J. He even gives us an example of a sacred pillar erected on a tomb, showing that he had no distinct opposition to the worship of the manes.¹ In the matter of sacred trees, both J and E seem to have shared the superstition of their contemporaries. But, in general, E shows a more advanced, at least a less anthropomorphic, conception of divine things. His fondness for dreams as the method of revelation is, perhaps, due to his idea of the distance between God and man, though popular conceptions doubtless had their influence.

The prophetic preaching of righteousness as a condition of Yahweh's good pleasure, has doubtless influenced our author. In his account of the covenant with Israel in the wilderness, he inserts not a decalogue but the whole codex which we have noticed under the name Book of the Covenant.² He could hardly be expected to see that legalism might become almost as fatal to spiritual religion as was the sensuousness of Baal worship. In his rehearsal of the various deliverances of the past, he doubtless comforted himself with the thought that the future was not altogether hopeless. It is possible, however, that he looked upon the monarchy as an institution contrary to the will of God, and that he rewrote the history of its rise under the hostile bias which betrays itself in the later portions of the book of Samuel.³ That he had a high idea of the prophetic office has already been noticed. Doubtless his political ideal was embodied in the theocracy whose executive officer was Moses, and which he thought to be revived in the time of Samuel.⁴

¹ There seems to be no other way to account for the *maçseba* on the tomb of Rachel, Gen. 35²⁰. That animism was a part of the popular religion down to a comparatively late date cannot be doubted.

² Ex. 20-23. Cf. what was said above, p. 174 ff.

³ Notably in 1 Sam. 7, 8, and 12—though in their present form these chapters are later than the time we are now considering.

⁴ I am aware that the writing ascribed to E shows marks of various hands. What has been said above applies to the edition published in the time of

Fuller light upon the state of things in Israel is given by the book of Hosea. The author, who is a younger contemporary of Amos, is in almost every respect his opposite. The strong moral purpose and the conviction that they have a divine message to deliver is common to both men. But in almost every other respect they are as different as men could be. Amos is the stern moralist; Hosea is the man of religious affection. Amos sees the righteous will of Yahweh pronouncing and executing judgment upon Israel; Hosea has a vision of the loving heart of Yahweh grieving over His erring children. The temperament of the men is different and their experiences in life bring the difference into high relief.

The remarkable thing in the life of Hosea is the cloud which rested upon it, which yet gave him new light on the nature of God. He married a woman who proved to be unworthy, and he tenderly loved her even after she was untrue to him. He seems to have suspected her fidelity as early as the birth of his second child, for he called the little girl by the strange name *Unloved*. His suspicions were confirmed before the birth of the next child, whom he called *Not-my-kin*. Then the faithless woman ran away from her home and abandoned herself to a life of shame, the end of which was to make her an abject slave. In spite of all her baseness Hosea found that his heart still went out toward her, and he bought her from her master that she might again be his own.

At the end of this experience, it was revealed to him that this was the Lord's doing. He saw that the scenes he had gone through were a presentation in human life of the drama in which Yahweh and Israel had the leading parts. Yahweh had chosen Israel as His own, but Israel had been unfaithful. The very names that Hosea had been led to give his children were revelations of the mind of Yahweh. *Jezreel*, the first-born, foreshadowed the vengeance that should be taken for the crime of Jezreel.¹ *Unloved*, the next child, shows the revulsion of feeling Jeroboam II or a little later. This edition did not include the decalogue of Ex. 20, nor the account of the golden bull now read in Ex. 32.

¹That is, Jehu's murder of the two kings and Jezebel. The blood rested upon the house of Jehu. The progress that is marked by Hosea, as compared with the time when the Yahweh party made Jehu their instrument, must be evident. The two passages which speak of Hosea's relations with his wife (1²⁻⁹ and 2¹⁻³) should be read together.

in the heart of Yahweh, in view of Israel's defection from Him. *Not-my-kin*,¹ the youngest, indicates the breaking off of the relations which had existed between Yahweh and Israel. And yet even when the final sentence of separation has been pronounced the heart of Yahweh goes out toward His people, as the heart of the prophet went out to his erring wife. He cannot give them up. Though for a time He may be unable to restrain them from wandering, yet His love impels Him to go after them. He will seek them and lead them again into the wilderness, where, as of yore, the covenant will be established between them. The heart of Yahweh is revealed to us by the heart of man.

Hosea is thus the man of the affections. This is the thing most clearly brought out by his book. But in other points also he differs strikingly from Amos. First of these is his attitude towards the popular religion. Both prophets reject the cultus, but they reject it for different reasons. Amos is impressed with the worthlessness of all ritual—"to obey is better than sacrifice and to hearken than the fat of lambs" might be a quotation from one of his discourses. He nowhere intimates that Israel's worship was offered to any but Israel's God. But he believes that ritual service has no value; if men will only do right, this service may be dispensed with. Hosea's position is different. He, too, rejects the popular ritual, but for another reason—he distinctly asserts that it has as its object, not Yahweh, but Baal. Here again he shows his religious temperament. He seems to be aware of the Canaanitish origin of the sanctuaries, and of the worship there offered. He sees that the intention of the people is to conciliate the Canaanite god of agriculture. He represents Israel as saying: "I will go after my lovers, *who give me my bread and my water, my wool and my flax, my oil and my wine.*"² This is, in essence, heathenism—it is serving God for hire. The people, to be sure, are unaware of the difference. They have identified Yahweh and Baal, and, so long as they are seeking Yahweh, they suppose they are in the right way. Hosea does not so judge. He sees that Baal is Baal, even though he is called Yahweh. The true God of Israel is of a different nature from Baal.

Another point is that Hosea, in contrast with Amos, looks upon

¹ Lo-ammi means either *Not-my-kin* or *Not-my-people* and is perhaps chosen for the double signification.

² Hosea 2⁵

the coming calamity not as the final destruction of the nation, but as a chastisement, out of which the people will come purified. It seems clear that Amos had no such hope. He believed that the disobedient nation was to be clean destroyed. What would follow he does not tell us. Could Yahweh exist without a chosen nation to serve Him? Amos does not answer the question. If he supposed that Yahweh would make choice of a new people, he nowhere revealed the thought. Perhaps he did not speculate. But Hosea could not rest in the thought of Israel's final destruction. He knew that the heart of God goes out to His people even in their erring: "Return, Israel, to Yahweh thy God, for thou hast fallen by thine iniquity. . . . I will heal their backslidings, I will love them freely, for my wrath has turned from them. I will be as the dew to Israel; he shall spring up like the lily . . . and shall be like the fruitful olive; he shall be fragrant as Lebanon."¹

Both in identifying the popular worship with Baal worship, and in holding out a hope of a restoration, Hosea was the forerunner of later writers. In truth, in uttering these two thoughts, he was more influential than any other one man whose writings have come down to us. The fact is clear that all late Hebrew writers agree in condemning the earlier generations for their desertion of Yahweh. Equally clear is it, that hope of a prosperous future beyond the present calamities became the mainspring of speech and of action almost from this time on.

Nevertheless, Hosea's picture of the state of things in his own time is as dark as that of Amos—darker, if that were possible. The religious defection which he discovered in the popular religion was accompanied by a moral defection that may well be called desperate. There is no fidelity and no knowledge of God in the land. False swearing, murder, theft, adultery, violence, are seen on every hand. The reason is found in the conduct of the leading classes. With Hosea these are not the nobles and landowners, but the priests and prophets; it is not strange that

¹ Hosea, 14²⁻⁷. The passage has probably been worked over—we can understand the temptation of the later editors to mitigate the severe denunciations of the earlier prophets. A number of such modifications are found in the Book of Hosea, and are easily recognisable as insertions. It must be true, however, that Hosea had hopes of a restoration. If Yahweh still loves His people though erring, there must be a future for them.

he, the man of religion, should find the chief guilt in the religious leaders. They are the ones who should instruct the people in righteousness; but instead, they lead them into sin. The unclean rites at the sanctuaries, the orgies of the sacred seasons—these are corrupting the heart of the people. Under the name of religion all sorts of abominations are connived at, nay, directly fostered by the religious leaders; because they were enabled thus to exploit the people for their personal gain. We may think of the festivals at the great sanctuaries as like the Arab fairs, where men's chief object was trade and dissipation. The chief sanctuaries thus become dens of robbers, where cheating and extortion are under the protection of the guilds of priests. The guilds of priests themselves profit by them like so many companies of bandits. In this way the priests have become a snare for the common people, and the royal house shares their guilt by not putting an end to these abuses.

The people themselves have an uneasy consciousness that all is not right with them. They have spasms of repentance in which they confess their sin. At the same time they comfort themselves with the thought that the door of repentance is always open; Yahweh is easily found, and though He has smitten, it is easy for Him to heal. Their good thoughts are evanescent—like the morning cloud, or like the mist that early vanishes away.¹ The lack of a sense of responsibility is seen in the way they treat the present crisis. At one time they will make their confession to Yahweh, but the next day they will be seeking help from Assyria or Egypt: "Ephraim saw his sickness and Israel his running sore; so Ephraim went to Assyria and sent to the Great King: but he is not able to save you or heal the running sore."² The nation is like the foolish dove which follows the call of the fowler, flying to meet its doom. Israel, as though infatuated, flies now toward Egypt, now toward Assyria: "They make a treaty with Assyria, and then send a present of oil to Egypt"—the very capriciousness of their conduct is enough to work their destruction. The frivolity in domestic affairs is equally marked with what shows itself in their foreign policy. Evidence is found in the frequent change of dynasty. They anoint a king in falsehood, and princes in deceit; they rejoice in the coronation fes-

¹ Hosea, 5¹³⁻⁶⁴, where the verses 1-3 are the lip confession of the people.

² Hosea, 5¹³, correcting some errors in the text; cf. 7¹¹, 8⁹, 12¹.

tival, and within a few days their wrath breaks out and they destroy the object of their uncertain loyalty. No wonder that Yahweh declares: "They set up kings but not of my will, they appoint princes but I take no knowledge of them." The monarchy as an institution is a punishment visited upon the people; but it can scarcely be a relief to have the whole frame of government swept away—"I gave thee a king in my wrath, and I will take him away in my fury."¹

Hosea's anticipations for the immediate future were therefore gloomy. Calamity was impending, though the love of Yahweh might spare a remnant for Himself. The present anarchy was, indeed, itself a manifestation of the wrath of Yahweh, but this was only a shadow of the coming event. Whether to Assyria or to Egypt, the people would be taken from their own land. Far from the soil made sacred by the presence of Yahweh, they would be condemned to eat bread desecrated by its dedication to a strange god. It was only justice that they should be given completely into the hand of the foreign gods to whom they had shown favour. Though the heart of Yahweh was love, His present mood was indignation: "Should I ransom them from the hand of Sheol? Should I redeem them from death? Rather, bring on thy scourges, Death! Hither with thy pestilence, Sheol! Pity is hidden from mine eyes."²

The political outlook was rapidly growing worse for Israel, and Hosea's gloomiest forebodings were justified. After a period of comparative inactivity, Assyria was asserting itself with fresh vigour under the rule of Tiglath-pileser III (B.C. 745-727). This monarch was not only a man of great energy of character, but he introduced a new policy for the empire. The earlier kings had for the most part been content to leave the subject nations some sort of autonomy. The native rulers were retained upon the throne and their internal administration was not interfered with, so long as the tribute was paid. Tiglath-pileser is remarkable for the constancy with which he speaks of appointing his governor over a conquered province. In fact, he characterizes

¹ Hosea, 13¹¹; cf. 7³, 8^{4, 10}, 10⁹. The prophet seems to anticipate that the fall of the house of Jehu will carry with it the abolition of monarchy. I cannot otherwise understand the threat: "I will visit the blood of Jezreel upon the house of Jehu and will blot out the kingship of the house of Israel," 1⁴.

² *Ibid.*, 13¹⁴, I have reproduced what seems to be the sense of the passage

himself as the king who subjugated the upper and lower countries, *deposed their kings and inaugurated his vicegerents*.¹ This measure was not enough, however, for his ideas of statecraft. It was supplemented by another to prevent the possibility of revolt. This was nothing less than the deportation of the inhabitants of a province, or a considerable fraction of them, and settlement of them among strangers at a distance from their home. In their new situation they would be unable to make common cause with their fellow-subjects and the throne would be secure. The ingenuity of the measure was not greater than its cruelty. Some of the unhappy emigrants were settled in cities built or enlarged by the king; some were brought to Assyria proper; some were placed in remote provinces. The king has left on record various instances of this procedure, giving account of the numbers transported and of the destination to which they were taken.² In this method of treatment was a new terror for the nations. The renewed activity of Assyria meant that ancient claims upon the nations of Syria would be revived, and if revived that they would be enforced in ways destructive to the national life.

We have already noted that the dynasty of Jehu came to an end with Zechariah ben Jeroboam. Shallum, his assassin, was murdered by Menahem, who had a troubled reign of ten years. He is mentioned by the Assyrians as sending tribute at the same time with Rezin of Damascus, the kings of Gebal, Tyre, Hamath, and a large number of other cities³ or countries of Syria. This is the tribute of a thousand talents of silver mentioned by the Biblical writer. Menahem raised the money by a direct tax upon the men capable of bearing arms. As they were assessed fifty shekels apiece, there were sixty thousand householders in the kingdom.⁴ This was in the year 738 B. C. Whether Egypt was already acting cannot positively be made out, but it seems that the Assyrians

¹ *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek*, II. p. 5. His account of his many conquests inserts in almost every case: *I set my vicegerent over them*.

² *Ibid.*, II., p. 29 f.

³ *Ibid.*, II, p. 31. The name of the King of Damascus is given by the Biblical writers as *Rezin*. The form *Rezon* (Assyrian *Rasunnu*) is perhaps nearer the original.

⁴ The owners of landed property were the only ones allowed to bear arms. It may be proper to remind the reader that the king called Pul in 2 Kings, 15¹⁹ is Tiglath-pileser. I have taken no account of the inscription of this king (*Keilinschr. Bibliothek*, II, p. 27) which speaks of *Azriyau* of *Yaudi*

kept a close watch upon the country of the Nile from a very early date. It was the natural policy of Egypt when threatened, to employ the Palestinian states as a buffer, if not to enlist them actively in its service. Palestine is the natural outpost of Egypt, and we are not surprised to learn from Hosea that an Egyptian alliance was agitated in Israel about this time. The tribute of Menahem kept things quiet for the time being. His son, Pekahiah was allowed to rule (or only to reign) two years, when he was cut off by one Pekah, apparently a misguided patriot who was hoping to throw off the Assyrian yoke. In this he was encouraged by Rezin of Damascus, who planned a general uprising of the western countries. Judah, where Ahaz was on the throne, would not join the coalition. The first endeavour of the allies, therefore, was to force Judah to join them. They invaded the country, and were able to lay siege to Jerusalem. It was a part of their plan to depose Ahaz, and put a Syrian prince on the throne,¹ and the terror they inspired in Ahaz indicates either that they were greatly his superiors in power, or that there was a strong party in Judah in sympathy with the invaders. Both may be true, but more weight must be given to the sympathy with the invaders. All the hot-heads and advocates of the ancient liberties of Judah would urge rebellion against the Assyrian oppressor. We may admire the courage of their programme without approving its discretion. In fact, the attempt was hopeless. Isaiah was right in predicting the early downfall of the two kingdoms.

Ahaz was moved by his fears rather than by the assurances of Isaiah. This is indicated by the effusiveness with which he threw himself into the arms of Assyria. With all the valuables of his own treasury, as well as those in the Temple, he sent the message: "I am thy slave and thy son; save me from the King of Syria and the King of Israel, who are attacking me."² Tiglath-pileser needed no prompting. The refusal of tribute by Rezin and Pekah

heading a conspiracy against the Assyrians. In spite of the similarity of names I cannot think that Azariah (Uzziah) of Judah was strong enough to head such a movement. For the other view, cf. McCurdy, *History, Prophecy, and the Monuments*, I, p. 347 f.

¹ Or perhaps to incorporate Judah in the Kingdom of Damascus, in which case Rezin himself is the "Son of Tabeal," of the account in Isaiah (7⁶); cf. Winckler, *Alttest. Untersuchungen*, p. 73 f.

² 2 Kings, 16⁷. The position of Isaiah will be considered again, more in detail.

had already set his army in motion. In the invasion which ensued Damascus was taken, Rezin was slain, large numbers of his people were deported to the East.¹ In this campaign the Great King carried his arms as far as Gaza. The whole land of Israel was taken in possession. Samaria was spared the horrors of siege, but large sections of the country were depopulated, the inhabitants being carried away to the eastern provinces of the empire. The reason that the capital was spared was that Hoshea, a creature of the Assyrians, succeeded in slaying the king, and put himself in his stead as the Assyrian appointee.² The impoverished land had to pay a tribute of ten talents of gold and a thousand talents of silver.

The next Assyrian king, Shalmaneser IV, has left us no annals. The Biblical writer says that Hoshea was found conspiring against his master, because he sent messengers to So, King of Egypt, and because he did not send the tribute. We can readily understand the delay in sending the tribute; it was a physical impossibility to wring anything from the exhausted country. The negotiation with the King of Egypt is less easy to account for. One would think that Israel had had object-lessons enough both to teach the power of Assyria, and to warn against the uncertainty of reliance upon Egypt. Still Egypt was a name to conjure with in Palestine. Its early power and wealth had laid upon its neighbours a spell that was never removed. Their repeated disappointments seemed to make them no wiser. At about the period now under consideration, Egypt was showing new activity. The king, whose name is *So*,³ according to the traditional Hebrew text, is probably to be identified with the *Sabako* of the Egyptian records. He was an energetic prince of Ethiopian origin, who succeeded in bringing all Egypt under his sway. His career might well make an impression on Hoshea. Active antagonism between Egypt and Assyria developed as a

¹ The capture of the city and the death of Rezin are mentioned, *2 Kings*, 16⁹. The Assyrian annals are still defective at this point.

² Tiglath-pileser claims to have slain Pekah, and to have appointed Hoshea, *Keilinschr. Bibliothek*, II, p. 33. Cf. Winckler, *Alttest. Untersuchungen*, p. 18. The twenty years' reign assigned to Pekah, by *2 Kings*, 15²¹, must be an error; see Paton, *Early History of Syria and Palestine*, p. 240.

³ The vocalisation is probably at fault. The Assyrian pronunciation *Sib'u* would indicate that the Hebrew consonants were originally intended to be read *Sewe*.

consequence of Sabako's ambitious plans. Doubtless he had worked up a coalition, of which Hoshea was a member. The Assyrian reply was an invasion which crushed out the remnants of strength that showed themselves in this convulsive movement. The first blow naturally fell upon Samaria. The city was invested, but held out two years. Meanwhile the country experienced the extremity of war. Shalmaneser did not live to see the surrender of Israel's capital. His successor, Sargon, enrolled it among his conquests. The other members of the coalition fared no better than Israel. Sargon carried his arms to the extreme south of Philistia, where he met the tardy Egyptian army and defeated it. He claims to have received tribute from a Pharaoh as a consequence of the battle.¹

The fall of Samaria took place early in the year B.C. 721. Sargon claims to have carried away 27,290 of the inhabitants of the city. These we may suppose to be the well-to-do, if any may be so described after a two years' siege. He says expressly that he left the rest in possession of their property. The country was formally made a province of the empire, a governor being appointed over it. Thus the Kingdom of Israel came to an end about two hundred years after its establishment by Jeroboam ben Nebat. The outlying districts had been ravaged, and numbers of the people carried away by Tiglath-pileser, whose work was now completed by Sargon. According to the Biblical narrative the unfortunate emigrants were settled in the Assyrian province of Gozan² and in the mountains of Media. Imagination has busied itself with the fate of the lost Ten Tribes, as though they must be retaining their coherence in some far-off country, ready for the return expected and described by the prophets. The his-

¹ Sargon's account is to the effect that Hanun of Gaza, together with Sib'u, General (*Turtan*) of Egypt, opposed him at Raphia. The place may be identified with *Tell Riph*, just at the *Wadi el Arish*, and therefore on the border of Egypt. Hanun had trusted in the strength of his fortifications, leaving the city to defend itself, while he and his troops effected a junction with the Egyptians. What were the relations between Sib'u and the Pharaoh who is named as tributary to Sargon is not clear. Cf. *Keilinschr. Bibliothek*, II, p. 55; McCurdy, *History, Prophecy, and Monuments*, I, p. 422. Winckler finds here the Arabian kingdom of *Mucri* instead of Egypt; *Keilinschriften und Altes Testament*,³ pp. 67, 146.

² In Upper Mesopotamia. On the text of 2 Kings, 17⁶, compare Winckler's *Alttest. Untersuchungen*, p. 108 ff.

tory we have traced allows us to cherish no illusions. The Ten Tribes in captivity are a figment of the imagination. There never was such a political or social entity. The Israelites were carried off as fragments, and as fragments they were scattered widely apart in the provinces of Assyria. In the struggle for subsistence among strangers they either succumbed to their misery or became absorbed into the communities in the midst of which they were planted. They had no faith in Yahweh strong enough to resist the influences by which they were surrounded. The fate of Israel made them doubt either the power or the affection of their God. Why should they persist in the worship of a God who had been unable to save His own, or else had cast them off? The gods of their neighbours might be more kind or more efficient than the God of their fathers. The prophets no longer spoke to them; the written Law had not yet become a power. We can understand how in such circumstances this should be their reasoning, and, as its consequence, that they should adopt the religion and the customs of their new homes.

A curious monument of the antique way of looking at religion is preserved to us in the sequel to our account. I refer to the story of the colonists who were brought into the land of Israel to take the place of those who had been carried away. We must, of course, remember that no country is ever absolutely stripped of its inhabitants. Such a thing is an impossibility. Even were it possible, the kings of Assyria had no interest in making a desert of any one of their provinces. Such an act would be contrary to their own interest. Their purpose in the transfer of peoples was to mix their subjects in such proportions that they would lose tribal or national coherence, and would find it impossible to revolt. In Samaria, as we have already noted, Sargon left a considerable number of Israelites in undisturbed possession of their property. Along with these he settled compulsory immigrants from the eastern provinces of his empire.¹

¹ 2 Kings, 17²⁴. The Hebrew writer, who lives at least as late as the Exile, names Babylon, Kutha, Avva, Hamath, and Sepharvaim as the native countries of the colonists. The more remote Babylon and Kutha are the probable sources. Possibly more than one settlement was made, since the book of Ezra (4³) speaks of a colony settled by Esarhaddon, and a little later (Ezra, 4¹⁰) we hear the colonists ascribe their settlement to Assurbanipal (Ashapper). On the questions involved, see Winckler, *Alttestamentliche Untersuchungen*, pp. 97-110.

The new settlers were soon in trouble. The country, so devastated by repeated wars, gave harbour to ferocious beasts. Lions increased to such an extent as to become a serious menace. In an age ignorant of firearms, such a calamity is always among the possibilities—an early Biblical writer found a sufficient reason for Yahweh's not dispossessing the Canaanites all at once in the danger that in the desolated country "the beasts of the field should increase" against the Israelites.¹ In the case before us, the new inhabitants of Samaria searched their consciences for a cause of the visitation. They found it in the wrath of the God of the land at their neglect of His worship. That they might make good their shortcoming, and that they might do it in the manner pleasing to Him, they petitioned the king of Assyria for an instructor in religion. One of the Israelite priests was therefore sent from the East "and taught them how they should fear Yahweh." The scorn of the narrator for the people who thus feared Yahweh, while still serving their ancestral gods, is evident, and makes us doubt the literal truth of his story. The need of a priest to teach the colonists is not apparent—there were enough Israelites left in the land to teach the traditional worship, even if we suppose the whole body of priests to have been carried away. But the actual result reached—the adoption of the worship of Yahweh—is probably correctly described. It is what would be most likely to take place in any ancient community. Yahweh was the God of the land. To neglect Him would be dangerous to the new settlers. We have seen just this tendency at work in the earlier times in relation to the Baal-worship of the Canaanites and its effect on the Israelites. And, if it made Yahweh-worshippers of the newcomers, the same tendency working on the deported Israelites would lead them to adopt the religion of their new homes, and would result in the practical abandonment of Yahweh.²

The old Israelite spirit seems not to have been wholly broken,

¹ Ex. 23²⁹. Even in this age of firearms, lions seriously interfered with the construction of a railway in Africa. See the London *Spectator* for March, 1900, p. 307.

² The account in 2 Kings, 17²⁴⁻³⁴, seems to be composite. The more ancient element represents the visitation of the lions as a chastisement by Yahweh, in punishment of the new people's neglect. It seems to see in the result a genuine adoption of Yahweh by the newcomers. A later hand emphasises the syncretistic character of the new religion, doubtless with a strong prejudice against the Samaritans.

even by conquest, siege, and the intrusion of strangers, for we hear of a revolt of Samaria two years after the surrender to Sargon.¹ But this was only the last convulsive gasp of the body politic in its death-throes. With the incorporation of Ephraim into the Assyrian province called "Beyond the River," it ceases to belong to the history of Israel. That history is carried on by Judah alone, who now receives our heightened interest.

For the last period of the life of Samaria, Judah has left us almost no records. As we have seen, the folly of Amaziah brought his kingdom into vassalage to Israel. It is not likely that the relation was changed during the lifetime of Jeroboam II. The king, whom we usually call Uzziah,² may have had energy enough to assert his independence. Almost the only thing that our sources record of his fifty years' reign is that he fortified Eloth at the head of the Gulf of Akaba and "brought it again to Judah."³ As Amaziah, his father, had conquered Edom, we must suppose that a revolt took place at the accession of Uzziah, but that it was quelled so far as to retain Eloth,⁴ and with it control of the Arabian commerce, in the hands of Judah.

Uzziah was afflicted with leprosy during the latter years of his life, and the administration of affairs was formally committed to his son Jotham. The author of the Book of Chronicles describes the leprosy as a visitation of God, in punishment for an act of sacrilege on the part of the king—he attempted to usurp the priest's function so far as to burn incense in the Temple. The Greek translator of the account emphasises the miracle by an earthquake accompanied by a celestial voice. The legendary nature of the narrative in both forms is evident. And the doubts which it occasions naturally extend to the Chronicler's account of Uzziah's success, both in war and in the arts of peace.⁵

¹ Perhaps disorders incident to the deportation of the people are dignified by the name of a revolt by Sargon.

² In the majority of cases he is so called in the Hebrew text, but he is several times called Azariah. The latter seems to be the original form.

³ 2 Kings, 14²². Amaziah's victory over Edom is related in 15⁷.

⁴ Our Hebrew text fluctuates between Eloth and Elath as the name of the place, and the English version also gives both forms. I have retained Eloth because the name was probably a plural.

⁵ The text of 2 Kings, 15⁵, is corrupt. While we are able to make out that Jotham administered justice in the king's stead, we are not able to say what treatment the king himself received. Apparently he was not compelled to isolate himself, except so far as the public business was concerned.

The comparatively brief reign of Jotham (B.C. 739-734) gives us nothing to record. We may well suppose that the shadow of coming events lay upon the country, and this is perhaps indicated by the Hebrew writer when he says that in those days Yahweh began to incite Rezin of Syria, and Pekah of Israel against Judah.¹ This means that Pekah, who assassinated his master near the end of Jotham's reign, was already pressing his plan of a coalition against Assyria. We need not suppose, therefore, that sympathy with the disorganisation in Israel was acute in Judah. The two kingdoms had long been separate, and had generally been hostile. Only half a century had elapsed since Jehoash entered the capital as a conqueror and razed a considerable part of its fortifications. Still, the traditional hostility could hardly keep thoughtful men in Judah from sympathising in the troubles of those who were, after all, of the same blood as themselves. The prophet Isaiah shows some traces of this sympathy, but his keen sense of the justice of Yahweh makes him view the coming calamity as testimony to the sinfulness of the sister kingdom. We may read his verdict in one of the early chapters of his book :

“ For Yahweh has rejected His people
The house of Jacob ;
For they are full of divination from the East
And of magicians, like the Philistines,
And they strike hands with foreigners.”²

The terms of the description leave no doubt that the prophet saw the kingdom of Samaria, in apparent external prosperity, entering into close alliance with other nations and adopting their superstitions. That Judah is travelling the same road does not make things better. More distinct is the following :

“ The Lord has sent a word against Jacob
And it has lighted upon Israel,
And the people shall know, all of them,
Ephraim and the dwellers in Samaria ;
Who stiffen their neck in pride
And in self-conceit, saying :
The bricks are fallen
But we will build with hewn stone ;

¹ ² Kings, 15 ³⁷. The sixteen years given to Jotham's reign must include the years of his regency.

² Isaiah, 2 ⁶. The whole passage should be read in this connexion.

The sycomores are hewn down
 But we will replace them with cedars.
 Yahweh will raise up his enemies against him,
 And will stir up his adversaries ;
 Syria in the east and Philistia in the west ;
 To devour Israel with open mouth.
 Even then His wrath will not turn away,
 And His hand is stretched out still."¹

The discourse continues with a still stronger denunciation of punishment. In line with Amos and Hosea the prophet discovers the reason for the coming calamity in the inhumanity of the upper classes "who issue iniquitous decrees and enact oppressive statutes, to shut out the lowly from justice, and to secure a decision by intimidation in the case of the oppressed."

The unity of the prophetic teaching in the two kingdoms is thus made evident. And that Jerusalem and Samaria were much alike is shown further by the fact that prophecies originally directed against Samaria have been adapted to the situation in Isaiah's own city. The most convincing instance is the powerful passage which begins with a woe upon the "proud crown of Ephraim, the drunkard." The proud crown is, of course, Samaria itself, and the threat that it shall be trodden under foot foreshadows the doom of the city. But as it has come down to us the paragraph has been made the text of a sermon against the drunkards of Judah.² In like manner the bold description of the Day of Yahweh bringing destruction "on all that is beautiful and brilliant, on all that is high and noble, on all the proud cedars of Lebanon, and all the lofty oaks of Bashan"—may well have been spoken in view of the impending invasion of the northern kingdom.³ But it is now a part of a discourse against the people of Judah.

The youthful Ahaz (B.C. 735-730) came to an inheritance of trouble. The temporary wave of energy in Samaria and Damascus showed itself in the invasion of Judah, to which allusion has already been made. At the same time (we may suppose) the

¹ Isaiah, 9¹⁻¹¹. For the text see Cheyne's edition in Haupt's *Sacred Books of the Old Testament* (1899).

² *Ibid.*, 28¹⁻⁴. The continuation is evidently by the prophet himself, but of later date.

³ *Ibid.*, 2¹²⁻¹⁷. Notice the continuation in 3^{1 ff.}

Edomites seeing their opportunity, regained the port of Eloth.¹ Almost all we know of the reign of Ahaz is contained in the account of the invasion given in the book of Isaiah.² The approach of the allied army caused a panic in Jerusalem. As the city has a precarious water supply, Ahaz at once proceeded to inspect the reservoirs. While thus engaged he was sought out by Isaiah, who had a special message of encouragement for him. It is not difficult to suppose that the king had earlier denunciations of the prophet in mind, and feared that the invasion portended the great Day of Yahweh. Isaiah is now charged to tell him that this is not the case. "Beware and keep calm! Do not fear or let thy heart grow faint before these two half-burnt pieces of firewood." Isaiah saw that the strength of Syria and Ephraim was already spent. There was no reason to fear them; and a sign of what the prophet expects was given. This sign is simply a prediction that a boy to be born in the coming year shall receive the name *God-with-us*, because of the signal deliverance then witnessed, and that before the same child is weaned, the two hostile countries shall be themselves ravaged by an invader. To make a deeper impression Isaiah calls his own son, born about the same time, *Haste-spoil-speed-prey*, as a second sign that the riches of Damascus and Samaria are to fall into the hands of the king of Assyria.³

Ahaz was not impressed by the calm faith of Isaiah. He had recourse to Yahweh in much more drastic fashion—if we may connect with this invasion the sacrifice of his son of which the book of Kings speaks.⁴ At the same time he had set his heart on a political measure—no less than complete submission to the Assyrian power. It was from this that Isaiah sought to deter him. The prophet's own theory was doubtless that Judah should

¹ 2 Kings, 16⁶, as amended by Klostermann.

² Isaiah, 7 and 8. The two chapters have been supplemented by later hands, as is shown in Cheyne's editions (text and translation), and in Duhm's commentary (*Handkommentar*, Göttingen, 1892).

³ It is evident that the two children, Immanuel and Maher-shalal-hash-baz, are given names symbolical of the same event. The destruction of Damascus (and virtually of Samaria) is to take place before one is weaned, before the other can talk.

⁴ 2 Kings, 16³. No other occasion in the life of Ahaz calls for so extraordinary a propitiatory act. The parallel with Mesha's sacrifice to Chemosh (3²⁷) is striking. What puzzles us is that Isaiah left no protest.

trust to Yahweh alone. This implied that the people (or the monarch) should undertake social reforms, for righteousness and humanity alone would secure the favour of Yahweh.

Political writers will probably criticise Isaiah's position as *doctrinaire*. But it is not certain that, even on the ground of an enlightened self-interest, Isaiah was not right. The two invading kingdoms were actually in no condition to carry on a prolonged siege. It was certain that in the near future, Assyria must interfere in order to conserve its own prestige. Had Ahaz chosen to rest in the righteousness of his cause, he would have been in a better position than he was in after his gratuitous submission to Assyria.

What actually happened was (as we have seen) that Ahaz sent all the treasure he could lay his hands on to Tiglath-pileser, with an appeal for help. The great king was perhaps already on the march. When he entered Damascus in triumph, he held a great *Durbar*, at which Ahaz was present. All that the Biblical writer tells us, is that innovations in the Temple were the result of this visit. Ahaz was pleased with an altar which he saw at Damascus, and sent the pattern to his priest at Jerusalem with orders to make one like it. This was set up in the Temple as the principal altar.¹ Other changes were made in the Temple as the result of this visit. A part of them—the cutting in pieces of some of the metal implements—may be accounted for as methods of raising money for the tribute. But structural changes belong in a different category. Whatever they were,² they were undertaken for the sake of the king of Assyria, and we shall do no injustice to Ahaz if we suppose they were intended to introduce the gods of Assyria to Jerusalem. Submission to the empire would logically imply such a step. The conscience of the king would pretty certainly find no objection to it, and the people at large would scarcely be more sensitive. Later generations would feel strongly the shame of such a desecration of the Temple, and it is

¹ Whether there was already an altar in the Temple is doubtful; for we have seen reason to suppose that the native rock furnished the original place of sacrifice. In that case the reference to the "copper altar," 2 Kings, 16¹⁴, is a later insertion as is, in fact, suggested by the language itself, which moreover is obscure in its indications of what was done.

² The text is unfortunately corrupt, but 2 Kings, 16¹⁸, speaks of alterations in the building, and 23¹² knows of a roof chamber (?) of Ahaz, in connexion with idolatrous altars.

possible that the obscurity of our account comes from a purpose to conceal the facts. Isaiah must have protested, but the protest has not come down to us, unless it be in the denunciation of the idols of which the land was full. And it must be remembered that the burden upon his heart was the moral, rather than the religious, obliquity of the people. This moral obliquity was, in fact, defection from the religion of Yahweh, and a new god more or less did not much alter the state of things.

CHAPTER XIII

HEZEKIAH AND MANASSEH

THE fall of Samaria, however impressive as an object-lesson, made no great difference in the political condition of Judah. The house of David still possessed the throne, and even breathed more freely in that its neighbour was no longer an independent kingdom, but a province under an Assyrian governor. The revolt of 720 B.C., to which allusion has already been made, was a part of the general uneasiness in Palestine. Sargon, as we know, that year made a campaign in which Philistia was severely punished. Judah seems not to have taken part. Ahaz had, in fact, committed himself too deeply to the Assyrians to think of revolt so soon. The vassalage continued throughout his reign, and into that of his successor.

The situation was, however, a difficult one for the youthful Hezekiah, who came to the throne about this time. The tribute was oppressive; Assyria was remote; there was a party favourable to Egypt, looking for an opportunity to revolt; the ancient liberties of Judah were doubtless remembered, and made the watchword of a party of zealots. Hezekiah, who thus inherited a situation not of his making, seems not to have been a man of steady purpose, and Isaiah's influence seems not to have been strong with him till toward the close of his life. We are not surprised that the reign was a time of disturbances and reverses. On the whole it is a credit to Hezekiah that he managed to keep his throne and to hand in on to his successor. Only a man of genius could have done more, and Hezekiah certainly was not a man of genius.

The chronology of our Hebrew sources is clearly at fault in regard to the accession of Hezekiah.¹ This must have taken place

¹ His accession is dated in the third year of Hoshea (2 Kings, 18¹), and the capture of Samaria is assigned to the *sixth* of Hezekiah. The ordinary Hebrew method of computation would make this the seventh, so that here is a discrepancy of one year. Now the invasion of Sennacherib is said to have

about the year 720. Besides the faulty chronology, the author gives us his religious estimate of the king in extravagant language. Sweeping reforms are attributed to him—the abolition of the High-places, the breaking in pieces of the pillars, the cutting down of the sacred pole. A tormenting question always arises in considering this description—whether the author has not been influenced by the conceptions of a later time. One thing stands out prominently, however, because it so evidently could not have been a later invention—Hezekiah “cut in pieces the copper serpent which Moses made; for until those days the Sons of Israel kept sacrificing to it, and it was called Nehushtan.”¹ The clause *which Moses made*, refers to a well-known narrative in the account of the wilderness wandering. Here we read that the people were bitten by serpents. Moses is therefore commanded to make a copper serpent, and raise it upon a pole. Whoever is bitten and looks at the serpent is healed. It must be clear that we have here a survival from the primitive totemism of Israel. The serpent race, the enemies of man, are worshipped in the image which presents their counterfeit to the eye. Sacrificing to it, which is here affirmed, is exactly the mode of worship described in the case of numerous other divinities.²

Why Moses should have made such an image for a people notoriously prone to idolatry is a question that need not be discussed. How such an image, if made by Moses, came into the Temple is also difficult to conceive. We are tempted, therefore to suppose the words *which Moses made* a later addition to the narrative and not the expression of Hezekiah's belief or of the belief of his contemporaries. In that case we must treat the Nehushtan as a veritable idol of the house of Israel, which had been worshipped in the Temple from the time of its erection.

taken place in the fourteenth of Hezekiah (2 Kings, 18¹³). But the capture of Samaria certainly belongs in the first year of Sargon, who reigned seventeen years, and whose successor did not invade Judah till his third campaign, which must have been his third year at the very earliest. The error is obvious. Sennacherib's invasion must be dated in 701, and both of the Biblical statements are at fault. See the discussion in McCurdy, *History, Prophecy, and the Monuments*, II, p. 248 ff.; Paton, *Early History of Syria*, p. 247.

¹ 2 Kings, 18⁴. The account of Moses's connexion with the serpent is found in Num. 21⁴⁻⁹.

² The word is **מקטרים**, which is incorrectly rendered *burning incense*. Even if it were only burning incense, it would be an act of worship.

Serpent worship is so wide-spread that we should be surprised not to find traces of it in Israel. We know of a Serpent's Stone near Jerusalem which was the site of a sanctuary,¹ and this sanctuary was dedicated to Yahweh. This parallel makes us conclude that the copper serpent of the Temple was also a symbol of Yahweh. If this be so it may be attributed to Moses, though in a different way from that taken by the Hebrew author; for Yahweh was introduced to Israel by Moses. Probably the serpent was thought to be a congenial symbol of the god of the lightning²—and that in the desert days Yahweh was the god of the lightning, or of the thunderstorm, seems well made out.³

What moved Hezekiah to the destruction of so venerable an object? We can suppose only that Isaiah was concerned in the matter. The prophet was an enemy of idol worship. He did not think highly of ritual of any kind. But with his exalted conception of Yahweh, the attempt to represent Him under animal forms must have been particularly obnoxious. His sarcastic allusion to the number of Judah's idols has already been quoted. Other passages of this kind are not easily found in the genuine prophecies of Isaiah. In general he is absorbed in the thought that the popular religion is all wrong and he does not stop to objugate individual features of it. One thing is clear. If the removal of Nehushtan from the Temple was due to Isaiah's influence it must have taken place toward the close of Hezekiah's reign. And whatever other religious reforms were undertaken belong in the same period. We have no evidence, however, that the removal of the High-places was a part of Isaiah's programme.

The Hebrew historian boasts further that Hezekiah "rebelled

¹ 1 Kings, i⁹ That Adonijah chose a sanctuary for his festival is evident.

² On the serpent and the lightning, see Baudissin, *Studien zur Semitischen Religionsgeschichte*, I, p. 264. The curious will find a collection of material concerning serpent worship in Deane, *The Worship of the Serpent* (1833).

³ I have laid no stress on the *Seraphim* of Isaiah's vision, though their name is identical with that of the desert serpents. The name Nehushtan must be connected with *nahash* (serpent). The occurrence of the proper names Nahash, Nahshon, and Nehushta among the Hebrews is readily accounted for if the serpent was an object of worship, but not otherwise. Speculations on the Babylonian origin of the Nehushtan may be read in the *Encyclop. Biblica*, *sub voce*.

against the King of Assyria, and did not serve him, and that he smote the Philistines to Gaza and its boundary, both watch-tower and fortified city."¹ The tradition has here preserved only one side of the case. Hezekiah did revolt from Assyria, and at the time of the revolt he gained a temporary advantage over his natural enemies the Philistines. But the sequel was sadly contrary to his hopes. With the help of the book of Isaiah and the Assyrian records we are able to trace the course of events.

The seditions at the accession of Sargon have already been alluded to, and some account has been given of this king's invasion of Philistia in 720. This campaign is perhaps alluded to in the little poem of Isaiah which the editor dates in the year of Ahaz's death:

" Rejoice not, all Philistia,
That broken is the rod that smote thee ;
For from the root of the serpent shall issue a basilisk,
And its fruit shall be a fiery dragon." ²

The *rod that smote* will be Shalmaneser, and the basilisk to follow will then be Sargon. Certainly the character of Sargon answers the description. He himself recounts how he invaded Philistia, besieged and captured Ashdod and other towns, carrying off the inhabitants. It is possible to suppose that Hezekiah, then just come to the throne, took part in this campaign, paying off Israel's old grudges against Philistia. But the supposition presents some difficulties, and it seems on the whole more likely that Hezekiah's Philistine campaign belongs in the time of Sennacherib.

A second expedition of Sargon is recorded nearly ten years after the king's accession. During these years Merodach-Baladan of Babylon was a thorn in the side of Assyria. He threw off the Assyrian suzerainty and was able to maintain himself against the efforts of Sargon. It need hardly be said that he strained every nerve to stir up revolt in the other dependencies of the empire. His embassy to Hezekiah, of which the Biblical writer makes

¹ 2 Kings, 18⁷¹, Kittel refers the two verses to different sources, on what grounds is not very clear.

² Isaiah, 14²⁸⁻³². On the date see Cheyne, *Introduction to Isaiah*, and his edition of the text. Recent commentators are inclined to assign the piece to a much later time

mention,¹ can be accounted for as an attempt to enlist Judah in such an enterprise. We may suppose that Hezekiah resisted the temptation at this time. But that he coquetted with the distinguished stranger is indicated by Sargon, who accuses Judah, along with Edom, Moab, and Philistia, of sending presents to Pharaoh, King of Egypt, "a prince who could not save them," inviting him to an alliance. The disorganised condition of Egypt at the time has caused some to doubt the possibility of its being prominent in such a movement. But the language intimates that the Palestinian states were ready to revolt—being aware of the troubles of Assyria in the East—even without substantial help from Egypt. In the year 711 Sargon sent a flying column against Ashdod and speedily reduced it to submission. In the year the Tartan came to Ashdod, we are told, Isaiah predicted the defeat of Ethiopia and the captivity of its people. The prophet had aroused attention by going barefoot and lightly clad for some time before this event, and he was now moved to declare: "So shall the king of Assyria carry away the captives of Egypt and the exiles of Ethiopia, young and old, naked and barefoot, with bodies exposed." He adds that the people of Judah will say: "Truly, if such is the plight of those to whom we looked, and to whom we fled for help to obtain safety from the king of Assyria, how can we ourselves hope to escape."²

Isaiah dissuaded from an alliance with Egypt and anticipated an Assyrian invasion of that country. Just yet matters did not proceed so far. Hezekiah was able to save his face, and perhaps gave support to the Assyrian expedition. Merodach-Baladan was, not long after this, defeated and driven from Babylon. His brief success a few years later probably had no influence on the fortunes of Judah.

The Egyptians, however, were not idle, and at the next change in the Assyrian throne trouble began to brew. The allied kings (for Egypt was now divided into several petty states) succeeded in enlisting the Palestinian peoples in an effort for freedom. The people of Ekron dethroned their king, Padi, because he refused to join the movement, and delivered him over to Hezekiah,

¹ 2 Kings, 20¹²⁻¹⁹, which is repeated with some changes in Isaiah, 39. The section is of late date, apparently taken from a life of Isaiah.

² Isaiah, 20⁶. I have adopted Cheyne's translation in the edition of Haupt (polychrome). *Tartan* is the title of the Assyrian general.

who kept him imprisoned at Jerusalem. Sennacherib, who had succeeded Sargon in 705, invaded Syria in his third campaign, which would be 701. He first conquered Sidon, where he placed a new king upon the throne. This blow was enough to satisfy some of the conspirators, and they hastened (Moab and Ammon are included) to make their submission. But Philistia and Judah held out. The Egyptians stood by their engagements so far as to send an army to the relief of Ekron. But in a battle fought at Eltekeh¹ they received a decided check. Ekron was obliged to surrender, and the popular leaders were impaled outside the walls. It was then Judah's turn. Hezekiah was compelled to deliver up his prisoner, who was again set in honour on his throne. The country was overrun by the Assyrians, forty-six walled towns suffered the horrors of siege and sack, over two hundred thousand people were carried into slavery, an enormous booty fell into the hands of the invader, Jerusalem itself was invested, though not regularly besieged. Hezekiah was obliged to pay a heavy fine and to send his daughters and concubines to Nineveh. Finally, his kingdom was reduced in size, a large part of his territory being taken away and added to adjoining states.

This is Sennacherib's account.² It is substantially confirmed by a paragraph in the book of Kings: "In the fourteenth year of King Hezekiah came up Sennacherib, king of Assyria, against all the fortified cities of Judah. And Hezekiah sent to the king of Assyria at Lachish, saying: I have sinned; turn from me! Whatever thou shalt lay upon me I will bear. So the king of Assyria laid upon him three hundred talents of silver and thirty talents of gold. So Hezekiah gave him all the silver that was in the House of Yahweh and in the palace treasury. At that time Hezekiah stripped the doors of the Temple and the pillars of the metal with which he himself had overlaid them and sent it to the king of Assyria."³

The inaccuracy of the date in this account need not detain us.

¹ The town is mentioned among those belonging to the southern settlement of the tribe of Dan, Josh. 19⁴⁴.

² *Keilinschr. Bibliothek*, II, pp. 91-97.

³ 2 Kings, 18¹³⁻¹⁶. Sennacherib states the sum exacted to be thirty talents of gold and *eight* hundred of silver. The discrepancy may have arisen from a confusion of the light and heavy talent. It should be noted that the construction of v. 16 is awkward, and that some other king was probably originally named as the decorator of the Temple.

Otherwise, the text is in agreement with the Assyrian claims, and its statements are not such as would be invented by a Judaite writer. The wonder was that Sennacherib stopped when he did, and this it is which impressed the contemporary witnesses of the event. Why did not the cruel and revengeful monarch go on with the siege of Jerusalem, take the city, and give it over to sack? Perhaps the abject submission of Hezekiah is sufficient to answer the question, especially as Jerusalem was a stronghold whose capture would call for large expenditure of time and men. The Assyrian sources throw no light on the subject. Hebrew tradition has an answer which we now read both in the book of Kings and in the book of Isaiah.¹ Two separate traditions seem here to have coalesced. One of these tells how the king sent one of his chief officers²—Rab-shakeh is the Assyrian title—from Lachish which he was besieging, to Jerusalem. His purpose is to stir up the people against Hezekiah. This he does by scoffing openly at Hezekiah's confidence in Egypt and in Yahweh. Egypt he compares (not ineptly) to a deceitful staff which breaks when one leans upon it, to the pain and hurt of its bearer. As for the trust in Yahweh he claims that it is by command of Yahweh that he himself has invaded the country.³ The request of Hezekiah's officers that the colloquy may be carried on in a language unfamiliar to the listeners on the wall is disregarded, and the Assyrian makes a direct appeal to the Jerusalemites against their king. Isaiah's advice, long disregarded, now becomes important. We may well suppose that the clear-headed prophet commanded the respect of his king. In response to Hezekiah's message the promise of Yahweh is given: "Fear not for the words which thou hast heard, where-with the servants of the King of Assyria have taunted me. I am about to put a spirit into him, so that he shall hear a rumour and return to his own land, and I will cause him to fall by the sword." From the following verses we understand that the spirit is a spirit

¹ 2 Kings, 18¹⁷–19³⁷, and Isaiah, 36, 37, with some differences of text.

² He alone is mentioned in Isaiah, 36. The author of Kings has expanded by adding the Tartan (general-in-chief) and the Rabsaris (chief eunuch?). On the title Rab-shakeh see Zimmern in the *Zeitsch. der D. M. G.*, LIII., p. 116 ff.

³ The reference to Hezekiah's reforms, and the enumeration of the gods which the Assyrians have overcome may be attributed to the Hebrew writer (see Cheyne's translation in the Polychrome Bible). But the claim that Yahweh was on the side of the invader is not improbable.

of panic, and that the report is a report of the Ethiopian approach. But it is possible that the earliest writer had in mind reports of rebellion in the eastern provinces. Something of this kind seems to have affected Sennacherib's movements. The assassination of the king, to which the author also alludes as a fulfilment of the prediction, is known not to have taken place for a number of years.

A duplicate tradition follows, in which the message of Sennacherib is put in the form of an unsealed (and therefore insulting) letter, and in answer to Hezekiah's prayers Isaiah is sent to him with the promise that the Assyrians shall not besiege the city. The sequel is the sudden destruction of the Assyrian army, 185,000 soldiers being cut off in a single night. The two accounts seem to refer to the same event. According to one the sudden and unexpected retreat of the Assyrians was due to panic arising from rumours of disaffection or invasion. According to the other it was due to an act of God.

We have a third tradition, given by Herodotus, from Egyptian sources. This is to the effect that Sennacherib's army, having advanced as far as Pelusium, was compelled to retreat by an army of mice, who gnawed the thongs of quivers and the strings of bows, so that the soldiers were defenceless, and retreat was necessary. The well-known connexion of the mouse with the pestilence argues in favour of making this account refer to the event which the Hebrew author represents as a sudden destruction of the army. We cannot suppose, however, that the Hebrew author borrowed from the Egyptian tradition, for the equation of the mice and the pestilence would be unfamiliar to him. It is equally improbable that the Egyptian tradition would consciously reduce the pestilence to terms of mice. All that is left to us is to admit that the suddenness of Sennacherib's return to Nineveh, was accounted for in the popular mind in three ways—the king's panic, the mice, and the pestilence.¹ The deliverance can hardly have been so signal as the narrative assumes. Had the Assyrian army been literally destroyed by a pestilence, the whole of Palestine would have fallen away afresh, or else have come into the hands of the Egyptians.

¹ Divine interposition was also assumed by the Egyptians, who regarded the mice as the army of their god, Horus—so, at least, Wiedemann interprets the statue which Herodotus connects with this event.

It is held by some scholars that Sennacherib made another expedition to the west, especially directed against Egypt, and that the Biblical accounts have united traditions which concern the two invasions.¹ The indications of the inscriptions seem hardly definite enough to sustain the hypothesis, and it does not seem likely that Hezekiah would revolt again after the severe lesson he had received.

We are able to associate some of Isaiah's most vigorous discourses with the campaign of Sennacherib, and thus to form some idea of the state of things in Jerusalem at the time. The prophet does not hesitate to repeat his earlier lament over the fall of Samaria and make it the text for a sharp arraignment of his own people; the implication being that the sinfulness of Jerusalem will bring about the same punishment which has been visited upon the sister city. And as in the former case the sins were not ritual offences but offences against common morality, so it is here:

“ These also stagger with wine
And reel with strong drink :
Priest and prophet
They stagger with strong drink,
They are overcome by wine,
They stagger with strong drink.
They reel in their vision,
They totter when giving judgment.
All tables are full of vomit,
Filth—no end.”

It goes with this that these influential classes are impervious to correction. They regard the prophet as a doddering idiot fit to talk gibberish to children. This scoffing tone is not simply the result of their abandoned drunkenness. They are inflated with the false confidence of those who trust in political measures. Whatever may come they feel that they have taken effective precautions:

“ We have entered into a treaty with death
And with Sheol we have made a compact ;
When the scourging scourge comes on
It shall not reach us ;
For we have made a lie our trust
And in falsehood we have taken refuge.”²

¹ Winckler in his *Alttestamentliche Untersuchungen*, p. 29 ff. His hypothesis is accepted by Benzinger in the *Handkommentar*.

² Isaiah, 28¹⁵. The preceding quotation is from 28¹; compare also 5²².

The oriental delight in finesse has never been better expressed. Shrewdness and subtlety are the weapons with which they think to fight their battles. Doubtless the fine scheme of an alliance among the western nations and a united effort against Assyria was maturing. Under the influence of the party favourable to Egypt, Hezekiah has sent an embassy to that country in order to perfect the alliance. Through the desert which lies between them and their destination, "they carry their goods on the backs of asses, and their treasures on the humps of camels to a people that cannot profit, whose help is idle and vain."¹ This embassy has been kept secret from the prophet and has taken the longer and more toilsome route through the desert so as not to attract the notice of the Assyrian officials in Philistia. But Isaiah has discovered it and heaps his scorn upon it. Not scorn only but open rebuke :

" Woe to the rebellious sons, saith Yahweh ;
 Who carry out a plan that is none of mine.
 Who go down to Egypt but have not asked of me,
 To flee to the stronghold of Pharaoh,
 And to take refuge in the shadow of Egypt.
 But the stronghold shall be your shame,
 And the refuge your confusion.
 Though his princes be in Zoan,
 And his ambassadors in Hanes—
 Every one shall be put to shame by a people that does not help."²

The end of all their pains will be to see the structure so laboriously raised fall in hopeless ruin : "like a bulge caused by a breach in a lofty wall, ready to fall in an instant, and to which breaking comes full suddenly—as one dashes an earthen pitcher to pieces shattering it ruthlessly."³

¹ Isaiah, 30⁶. Chapter 18 seems to imply that the Ethiopians responded to the overtures, sending an embassy in turn.

² Isaiah, 30¹⁻⁵. I have left out an unessential couplet, and have followed Cheyne's text. Some scholars connect these discourses with Sargon's campaign of 711.

³ In interpreting these discourses, I have assumed that Egypt is the nation intended by the Hebrew word *Miçraim*. Winckler supposes that a North Arabian kingdom of *Mucri*, of which we have traces in the Assyrian inscriptions, is the country intended. While some of the Biblical passages which now speak of Egypt may have originally referred to such a district in Ara-

In an earlier crisis we have seen Isaiah dissuading from foreign alliances, and urging that attention should be paid to internal reform. There is no reason to suppose that his principle was any different in this later struggle. The rebuker of counsellors and courtiers was not the spokesman of a mere political party. To do right was the only policy he cared to urge. Yahweh is a God of justice. He will apply the standard of righteousness to Jerusalem as one holds a plumb-line to a wall.¹ Whatever does not conform to this standard shall be swept away. The true policy of people and rulers is to do right, trusting in the righteousness of Yahweh: "By repenting and remaining quiet you shall be delivered; in resting and in trusting shall your strength consist."²

The restless ambition of the politicians found the counsel insipid. They were for a vigorous foreign policy, leaving "parish concerns" to take care of themselves. Isaiah saw that this was to invite calamity, and he foresaw the calamity in the shape of an Assyrian invasion. In one discourse we still read the woe pronounced in view of the impending siege.³ In another we have a description of the invading army making its way from the north along the road familiar to all Israelites. The successive camping places are named till the enemy stands on the ridge just north of Jerusalem, and shakes his fist at the daughter of Zion.⁴ In this anticipation the prophet takes up the thought of Amos. Yahweh is God of the whole earth and He uses the nations to carry out His plan. Isaiah adds that the human instrument is not conscious that he is carrying out Yahweh's plan; he is following his own designs and knows nothing further:

Ah, Assyrian, rod of my wrath,
And staff of my indignation!
Against a godless nation do I send him,
And against the objects of my wrath I give him command;

bia, this does not seem to be the case with those we have been considering. A full presentation of the case for *Mugri* may be found in the article "Mizraim" in the *Encyclop. Biblica*, Vol. III.

¹ Isaiah, 28¹⁷. The figure is not original with Isaiah, cf. Amos, 7⁷⁻⁹.

² Isaiah, 30¹⁵.

³ Isaiah, 29, which is obscure in places but which seems to assert that the siege will come after one year more.

⁴ Isaiah, 10²⁸⁻³². The prediction was not literally fulfilled, whether we refer it to B.C. 721 or 701.

To take spoil and to seize booty,
 And to tread them down like mire of the street.
 But he does not so imagine
 And his mind reckons not so;
 But only to destroy is in his mind,
 And to cut off nations not a few."¹

That in fact Assyria is carrying out the plan of Yahweh is enough for the prophet to know, and this is what he is here content to affirm. It is evident, however, that if the purpose of the Assyrian is altogether selfish, he in turn will become obnoxious to the divine justice, and that his punishment will follow in due time. This thought, however, seems to have come only on later reflection.

Isaiah's anticipation was fulfilled, as we are abundantly certified by Sennacherib's description of his campaign. The preacher of righteousness did not fail to improve the occasion. His discourse gives a vivid picture of the country at the height of the invasion. The land was desolated, the cities burned with fire, the crops were devoured by strangers, Jerusalem was left a wreck, as the winter shows those frail shelters erected for the watchmen of the vineyards now falling to pieces.

It is a common experience, however, that signal judgments of God often bewilder or harden rather than humble and convert the evil-doers. So it was in Jerusalem. In the very face of the calamity some gave themselves up to feasting and revelry. The city was a tumultuous city, a joyous town; the people snatched at the last opportunity for sensuous enjoyment—*to-morrow we die* was their thought.² Others, to be sure, resorted to religious exercises in the hope that Yahweh might be pacified. The altars streamed with blood; burnt offerings of rams and the fat of fed beasts ascended in constant clouds of smoke; the Temple courts were thronged with crowds who came to see the face of Yahweh. But in the prophet's eyes all this indicates persistence in the old error. All this ritual service is vain. Yahweh is weary of it: "My soul hates your New Moons and your set feasts. . . . When you spread out your hands I hide my eyes from you; when you multiply prayers I do not hear." The only accept-

¹ Isaiah, 10⁵⁻⁷.

² Isaiah, 22. The chapter describes the bustle in the town in face of the expected siege, notice vv 8-11.

able service is righteousness. These worshippers instead of presenting the blood that will propitiate, only bring hands red with crime. How can Yahweh fail to see what is going on? The judges decide against the poor, the leaders lead the people astray; instead of being correctors of crime they are its accomplices: "Everyone loves a bribe and seeks after baksheesh; the case of the widow does not come before them, they do not give judgment for the fatherless."¹

Did Isaiah anticipate the complete destruction of Judah? We can hardly suppose so, though some things which he has left on record seem to indicate that he did. In the passages we have been considering he fixes his eye on the great fact that Yahweh is about to punish evil-doers. The weight of the blow will fall on His adversaries. Absorbed in this thought the prophet does not pause to consider a problem which afterward became acute, the problem of the destruction of the righteous with the wicked. Among the Judaites carried into slavery by Sennacherib must have been many to whom Isaiah's condemnation did not apply. The destroyer of a city by siege or storm does not discriminate between the righteous and the wicked. His sword devours one as well as the other. A Pentateuchal writer, apparently not much later than Isaiah, shows how some minds were already beginning to be exercised by this problem. He sets forth the fact that if Sodom is destroyed, the few righteous men who may be sojourning in it will meet an undeserved fate, and this does not accord with the justice of the Judge of all the earth.² No such difficulty seems to have been present to the mind of Isaiah.

The tendency of the earlier prophets to deal with the nation as a whole here shows itself. But there is evidence that Isaiah sometimes advanced beyond this point of view. His general theory of his work is strikingly set forth in the account of his inaugural vision, where he receives the command: "Go and say to this people: Hear on, but do not understand; see on, but do not perceive! Make the people's mind stupid and their ears dull, and plaster up their eyes—lest they see with their eyes and

¹ Isaiah, I, from which I have quoted the greater part of this description, is now arranged as a single discourse, though perhaps combining what was spoken at different times. The situation which it so vividly describes can scarcely be any but the one at Sennacherib's invasion.

² Gen. 18²³⁻³³.

hear with their ears, and their mind apprehend and their health be restored.”¹ We can interpret this language in only one way—the prophetic message would harden the people, and thereby make the impending destruction only the more certain. As if to leave no doubt on this score, the prophet declares that his mission would last till the land should be wasted without inhabitant, and adds: “Even were there left in it a tenth part, this also must be consumed like a terebinth or an oak of which, when it is felled, only a stump remains.”² The stump is not here the source of new life; it is the dead and useless fragment which must be dug up and burned to get it out of the way. The destruction of the nation must be complete.

And yet—and yet there are the passages concerning the remnant, and these show that the hope of the believer refused to accept so sweeping a statement. The judgment will be something more than a vindication of the divine justice. It will result in, or it will be followed by, a restitution. Yahweh will give His people officers like those of the good old days, so that Zion may again be called a city of right. More striking is the word spoken out of the midst of the scathing denunciation we have already considered, dating it in the time when conspiracy was rife: “Behold I lay in Zion a stone, a tried stone, a precious foundation stone; he who trusts shall not be moved.”³ The confidence of the prophet that there would be some to trust in Yahweh, inspired him in naming his son—perhaps his first-born—*A-remnant-will-turn*. And this remnant began to realise its mission during Isaiah’s own life, for he had a band of disciples to whose keeping he could intrust the message he had received.⁴

The prophet’s faith came out most fully at the hour of disaster.

¹ Isaiah, 6^{9f}. That the actual result of the preaching shows what the divine purpose was in commissioning the preacher, is quite in accord with Biblical thought.

² Isaiah, 6¹³. Some copyist, remembering the word of Job (14⁷⁻⁹) which pictures the stump as sprouting again, has inserted a clause in this passage to make it teach the same lesson. But the insertion was made so late that it had not become universally current when the Greek translation was made.

³ Isaiah, 28¹⁶—text of Cheyne and others.

⁴ Isaiah, 8¹⁶. In the same connexion the prophet declares that he and his sons are signs of what shall come to Israel. He alludes to the significance of his own name, “*Deliverance-of-Yahweh*,” which of course is hopeful for the future.

He had been most pessimistic when the people were most confident, but when the crisis came he was the one most confident. He was sure that Jerusalem would not be given over to sack, and possibly even went so far as to expect the destruction of Assyria in immediate sequence to the invasion of Palestine. The impregnability of Zion as a fortress could hardly be the ground of such confidence. It was a religious faith that Yahweh was in the midst of His people, though they were so unworthy.

That Yahweh would deliver His city, that He would punish the pride of Assyria, that He would bring back the good old times—a very rudimentary Messianic faith is this, but it is almost all that we can attribute to Isaiah. We may suppose that the remnant who should repent, presented itself to his mind as a nation with a monarch at its head. This monarch would naturally be of the line of David. His rule would be distinguished by its justice, for the function of the king is to secure justice, protecting the poor from the rapacious nobles. Commanding the favour of Yahweh, such a reign would be a time of external peace and internal prosperity. So much is logically implied in the hope of the remnant, and some such picture of the future may have been drawn by the prophet. But the various Messianic prophecies which we now read in his book have been inserted there by later hands.¹

In the hope that we may find additional light on the period, we turn to the prophet Micah, whom we know from a passage of Jeremiah to have been a contemporary of Hezekiah.² The little book which has come down to us under his name is, however, only in part from his own hand, and that part has been disfigured by the errors of copyists. So far as we can use it with confidence, we find that it describes the state of things which is made known to us by Isaiah. The opening discourse was spoken in full view of the catastrophe which threatened Samaria, and at a time when the author expected the same fate to overtake Jerusalem. As in the earlier prophets, the reason is found in the sinfulness of the people. No more severe indictment against the upper classes can be found than we here read: "Hear, ye chiefs of Jacob and ye judges of the house of Israel! You surely

¹ For example, the fine description of the ideal king in 11 1-8.

² Jer. 26¹⁸ gives this information, citing the most striking of Micah's predictions in order to commend the tolerance of Hezekiah.

ought to know what is just ! Yet you hate good and love evil ; you who devour the flesh of my people, tear their skin from them, and break their bones.”¹ This is the old story of rapacity as we read it in Amos, Hosea, and Isaiah. The only thing original in Micah is the bitterness of the polemic against the popular prophets. The opposition of different sets of prophets to each other is no new thing ; it is at least as old as the time of Ahab, where Micaiah takes a position contradicting that of the majority, and where he supposes them deceived by a lying spirit. But our Micah has to contend with bitter and unscrupulous opposition, from prophets who have become mere time servers, pandering to the wishes of the community : “ Thus says Yahweh against the prophets who cause my people to err, who, when they get something to eat, say all is well, but declare a crusade against whoever does not put bread into their mouths.” And with fine irony he says in another place that if one comes claiming the spirit and prophesying of wine and strong drink he will be an acceptable prophet.²

We may suppose that Micah, living in a country district, realised more vividly than Isaiah the corruption of the leading classes. He is also less hopeful than Isaiah. His outspoken denunciation of the sinfulness of Judah reaches its culmination in a sentence which his contemporaries regarded as treason : “ Therefore on your account Zion shall be ploughed as a field, Jerusalem shall become ruins and the Temple mount a wooded hill.”³

It was this bold declaration, which is certainly more advanced than anything we have from Isaiah, which impressed succeeding generations. As we read these utterances we feel that we could wish to know more of the man—a champion of right, fearless in denouncing oppression and wrong, and moreover who stayed himself on God when the world was all against him. But we are obliged to content ourselves with a mere glimpse. What little he gives us confirms the picture painted by Isaiah.

If our supposition is correct, the lesson taught by Sennacherib

¹ Micah, 3^{2f}. The vigour of the passage has been weakened in the current text by scribal insertions.

² *Ibid.*, 2¹¹, cf. 3⁵.

³ *Ibid.*, 3¹². These first three chapters of Micah are all that can be ascribed with certainty to the Micah who was contemporary with Isaiah. The rest of the book is for the most part post-exilic, as was shown by Stade, *Zeitschrift f. d. Alltest. Wissensch.* I., pp. 161-172.

was taken to heart by Hezekiah. The experiences of the year 701 must have thoroughly discredited the Egyptian alliance, and must also have greatly enhanced the influence of Isaiah. The Biblical account indicates that about this time the king had personal reasons to esteem the prophet. In a severe illness which befell him, the prophet came to him with a message of hope which was followed by his recovery. It can scarcely be that such an experience would not affect the king's attitude toward the prophet. We may plausibly suppose that during the period which followed, Hezekiah, at the suggestion of Isaiah, undertook the religious reforms which have been already described.

The Biblical writer indicates that the king devoted his closing years to internal improvements, especially to the water supply of Jerusalem. The reservoir and canal mentioned in this account¹ may be plausibly identified with the tunnel which leads from the so-called Fountain of the Virgin to the Pool of Siloam. The inscription discovered in this tunnel in our own times gives no clue to the age of the work. But there is nothing in its wording or in the form of its letters to prevent attributing it to Hezekiah. Of Isaiah's later years we know nothing—or rather, we do not know that he long survived the great Assyrian crisis. The tradition that he was murdered by Manasseh has no early authentication.

Hezekiah was succeeded by his son, Manasseh (692–639), of whose long reign the historian has little to relate. Orthodox public opinion saw in him the incarnation of wickedness. “He did evil in the sight of Yahweh, like the abominations of the nations whom Yahweh dispossessed before the sons of Israel. He rebuilt the High-places which Hezekiah, his father, had destroyed, and he raised altars to Baal, and made an Ashera as Ahab, King of Israel, had done, and worshipped all the host of heaven, and served them. . . . And he offered his son in the fire, and practised augury and magic, and made talismans and charms.”² The indictment is certainly heavy enough, and those who drew it up could understand the king's action only as the manifestation of sheer depravity. For us, while it may not be true that *tout comprendre, c'est tout pardonner*, there may be mitigating circumstances.

¹ 2 Kings, 20²¹; cf. Benzinger, *Hebräische Archäologie*, p. 53 f.

² 2 Kings, 21²⁻⁶. I have quoted the gist of the passage, which shows the marks of different hands.

We have seen that Hezekiah introduced religious reforms, probably under the influence of Isaiah. No such reforms are ever made without encountering opposition. When made by the royal power they are carried through by force, rising often to violence. The directions of the Deuteronomist show how the power of the state was invoked to carry out the programme of reform. Violence begets violence. The destruction of the Nehushtan doubtless outraged the feelings of many a conservative Judaite. The time-honoured symbol of Yahweh was associated with the history of the people from the time of Moses. Why should it be ruthlessly destroyed by this innovating king? Such a question must have been asked in Jerusalem, and even in the court itself. If we may judge by the present condition of society in the East, the women of the palace were devoted to the ancient superstitions. It is, in fact, a general rule that older religious rites and notions are held longest by women—the necromancers and dealers in charms or talismans are usually women according to the Old Testament records. Manasseh came to the throne very young. It is natural that he should be much under the influence of the harem. It is likely, also, that the courtiers of Hezekiah were many of them out of sympathy with his reforms. The crown prince in any court is likely to fall into the hands of a clique belonging to the opposition party, and it is not extravagant to suppose this case an example of the rule.

On the part of the court ladies, personal resentment at Isaiah may have been a motive leading them to prejudice the young prince against him. The prophet, in denouncing the vanity and corruption of his times, did not spare the women of Jerusalem :

“Because Zion's daughters are haughty,
And walk with neck thrown back, and leering eyes,
Tripping along as they go, and making a chime with their anklets—
With scabs will the Lord incrust the crowns of their heads,
Yahweh will expose their shames ;
Instead of perfume there shall be rotteness,
And instead of a girdle a rope,
Instead of artful curls, baldness,
And instead of a flowing mantle, girding of sackcloth.”¹

¹ Isaiah, 3^{16, 17, 24}. I have followed Cheyne's translation, only substituting a pronounceable name for the unpronounceable one *Jhv'h*. The passage in our Bibles has been expanded by some ladies' tailor, who has inserted a long catalogue of finery.

So indelicate a denunciation could not fail to offend the smart set. They remembered, also, an earlier message of the prophet, pronouncing a woe upon Judah because a boy was their governor and women ruled over them. Occasions of misunderstanding are plenty in the court of a petty kingdom, and Manasseh may have been the victim of his circumstances. All the influences by which he had been surrounded from his youth were reactionary, and it is not strange that he should view himself as the restorer of Judah's ancient worship. The Nehushtan could not be restored because it had been wholly destroyed. But the local sanctuaries could be repristinated. They may not have been removed by Hezekiah, but after the sweeping Assyrian desolations, they may have been discredited in comparison with the Temple, which had been so remarkably preserved. The Baal altars, mentioned by the historian, may have been these same High-places which had been adopted by the Israelites from their predecessors. The Ashera, here so strangely associated with Ahab, was only the sacred pole found at every altar of Yahweh. Whether it had been removed by Hezekiah may be left an open question. That it became obnoxious to the reformers from this time on is evident from the bitterness of the Deuteronomist.

Whatever of magic and necromancy had been discouraged by Hezekiah now came again to the front. The flourishing condition of these arts is testified by the Deuteronomist. These superstitions are connected with the worship of the demons, fairies, cobolds or jinn, with which the earlier Semitic religions (like all others) swarm. The sacrifice of the king's son is a return to ancestral custom, as we have noticed in the case of Ahaz. Jeremiah speaks of such sacrifices as common in his time, and Ezekiel regards them as a part of Israel's early religion. Their hold on the piety or the superstition of the people must have been very strong.

All the measures thus far considered are a part of a conservative reaction—a return to what had always been Israel's practice. Another item does not stand on the same plane with these, but is easily explicable—the restoration of altars to the *host of heaven*. Sun, moon, planets, and constellations are objects of adoration in the religion of Assyria and Babylonia. As a faithful vassal of Assyria, Manasseh was bound to honour these gods. Ahaz had introduced and fostered their worship. Hezekiah had ap-

parently discountenanced it so far as he dared. But Manasseh encouraged it and gave it renewed prominence.

What he did was no more than had been done by Solomon. But times had changed. Though the prophets had seemed to speak to deaf ears, yet in reality their message had succeeded in reaching a part of the people. Consciences were more sensitive than of yore, and the uneasy feeling that Yahweh was a jealous God brought forward protests against Manasseh's measures. Men like Isaiah and Micah left disciples. We are justified in supposing them united in a party of opposition, weak indeed, but containing the germs of larger things. Religious opposition to the crown, however, was political opposition, and political opposition was treason. It is easy to interpret the declaration of the Book of Kings, therefore, where it says that Manasseh shed innocent blood very much, and filled Jerusalem from end to end with blood.¹ This vigorous policy seems to have silenced open opposition. We hear of no prophet who stood up to make public protest.² The silence of our records on this head may be an unsafe guide. Whatever was done or not done in the way of public speaking, the prophetic party cannot have been idle, and it is reasonable to suppose that their activity found a congenial field in literature. The union of the two works which treat the patriarchal history (J and E) is dated by some critics in the reign of Manasseh. The legends of the great prophets who fought on the side of Yahweh against the encroachments of Baal would now have a special meaning and interest. The works of Amos, Hosea, and Isaiah would be cherished and studied. And already the Deuteronomist was collecting the traditions of Moses' legislation, and meditating a new edition of them, enlarged by stringent commands against Canaanitish heathenism. But we are obliged to content ourselves with conjectures as to what was going on in secret. In the open we see only the complete restoration of the old stage of belief and ritual.

The reign seems to have been a time of peace with foreign nations. Assyria was unbroken in strength, and Manasseh was willing to pay his tribute, thereby purchasing peace. His relig-

¹ 2 Kings, 21¹⁶. Jeremiah has the same thing in mind: "Your sword has devoured your prophets" (Jer. 2³⁰).

² Possibly Micah's answer to the question concerning child sacrifice (Micah 6⁶⁻⁸) may be as late as Manasseh's time.

ious enactments were in themselves a declaration of complete submission to Nineveh. Egypt, moreover, was weak and offered no temptation to revolt. Esarhaddon, who came to the throne in 680 B.C., was, in fact, able to carry his arms against that country, and to capture Memphis, after which the whole kingdom made its submission. This event had been preceded by the reduction of Sidon, and by a successful campaign against the Arabs of the Sinaitic peninsula. The only mention which Esarhaddon makes of Manasseh is in the list of "twenty-two kings of the Hittite country who furnished timber" for the great armoury then building at Nineveh.¹

Ashurbanipal, the next king of Assyria, was also involved in war with Egypt. Tirhaka, king of Ethiopia (that is, Nubia), descended the Nile to Memphis, expelled the Assyrian governors, and proclaimed himself King of Egypt. The Assyrian army, marching to regain its province, was this time reinforced by Palestinian troops. Among the kings who furnished contingents, we find again the name of Manasseh.² This expedition advanced as far as Thebes, and a second expedition, rendered necessary by a revolt of the Egyptians not long after, was equally successful. The practical demonstration of the weakness of Egypt must have strengthened the hold of Assyria on its subjects in the West. A further object-lesson was the repetition by Esarhaddon of the colonisation of Samaria, to which allusion has been made. All in all, the policy of fidelity to Assyria was justified by worldly wisdom.

The author of the book of Chronicles knows indeed of an attempted rebellion of Manasseh, of his capture and transportation to Babylon, where he repented and was restored to his kingdom.³ The fruits of his repentance are also recounted to us in the way of religious reforms in Jerusalem. In view of the silence of the earlier sources, this account must be received with caution.

¹ *Keilinschr. Bibliothek*, II, pp. 137, 149. In the list we find Tyre, Edom, Gaza, Edom, and Moab. The expedition against Sidon (*Ibid.*, p. 125) seems to have affected that city alone. Winckler adds that Manasseh furnished troops for the Arabian expedition as well as for the one against Egypt, both which he dates 671 B.C.; cf. *Keilinschriften und Altes Testament*,³ p. 90.

² *Keilinschr. Bibliothek*, II, pp. 161, 329.

³ 2 Chron. 33¹¹⁻¹⁹. The mention of Babylon which formerly made a difficulty does so no longer, because we know that Ashurbanipal spent a great deal of time in that city.

The brief reign of Amon is scarcely an incident in Old Testament history. All that the Hebrew historian tells us of him is that he walked in all the ways of his father, and served the idols which his father served. Besides this we learn only that he was assassinated in his palace, as the result of a plot of his officers. Whether this was a harem intrigue in favour of some other member of the royal family will never be known with certainty. The statement that the people of the land (that is, the people at large in distinction from the court officials) smote the conspirators and set Josiah on the throne, implies strong opposition between them and the court. It is possible that Josiah was already known as a member of the prophetic party.

CHAPTER XIV

JOSIAH AND HIS SONS

WHAT was said above about the influence of the harem upon a young prince would seem to apply with equal force to Josiah, for he was only eight years old when he came to the throne (B.C. 637). Yet Josiah was wholly in the hands of the reforming party. We might account for this partly by recalling what was said about the crown prince being in the party of opposition. But we do not know that Josiah was the heir apparent. He seems to have been made king by a popular movement in opposition to a strong party at court. While Manasseh was violently reintroducing ancient abuses, it is reasonable to suppose that some even of his own family were unwilling to go his lengths. The reformers, making quiet propaganda among the people, had means of approaching the court. The blood of the martyrs is the seed of the Church, and from those put to death for their fidelity to their convictions some voice might penetrate as far as the king's harem. The priest Hilkiah seems to have been one of the reformers, and we may suppose him one of the thoughtful men to whom the writings of Isaiah and the story of his life would make a strong appeal.

We are told nothing of the reign of Josiah till his eighteenth year, when there occurred an event of the first importance not only for his time but for all succeeding ages. This was the finding of the Book of Instruction.¹ The Biblical account is to the effect that in Josiah's eighteenth year he sent his secretary, Shaphan, to take account of the money in the collection-box in the Temple—we have already learned of the arrangement made by Jehoash.² Shaphan was to act as inspector, while Hilkiah made

¹ This is the name by which the book is called in the Biblical account (2 Kings, 22³⁻¹³), and we may conveniently retain the title. The later Jews applied the same name (*Sepher ha-Tora*) to the whole Pentateuch, which, however, we may call the *Book of the Law* in order to avoid confusion.

² 2 Kings. 12⁴⁻¹⁶. The account of the finding of the book is in 2 Kings, 22³⁻²⁰.

his reckoning. After the main business was attended to, Hilkiah informed Shaphan that he had found the Book of Instruction in the House of Yahweh—in the Temple proper, would be the natural understanding of the words. How the book came to be in this particular place, or how it came to be found at this particular juncture, is not told. We may conjecture that the priest had been inspecting the repairs, or making ready for them; that he had been taking an inventory of the store chambers; that he had been cleansing the Holy Place—plenty of occasions exist; and there seems to be no reason to doubt the statement that he *found* the book. It was an event unexpected to himself, and not a mere subterfuge to get the book into the king's hands.¹

Shaphan read the book and was so much impressed by it that he brought it to the king and read it to him. There is no question of illegibility or of difficulty in decipherment, such as the scribe would have found had the book been of great age. The book was of no great size, as we may conclude from its being read twice after a considerable part of the day had passed in regulating the money matters of the Temple. To all appearance there was still time, the same day, for an embassy to Huldah and for a third reading.

The effect upon the king was immediate and pronounced. He rent his clothes in grief and terror, and at once took steps to discover the mind of Yahweh: "Inquire of Yahweh for me and for the people and for Judah concerning this book, for great is the wrath of Yahweh which is kindled against us." To ascertain the mind of Yahweh a distinguished embassy was sent to Huldah, a prophetess, wife of one of the king's officers. She gave a response confirming the king's fear, and denouncing the idolatry and disobedience of the people. In our present text she is made also to declare that punishment is inevitable, but that it will be delayed till after Josiah's death because he himself is right-minded toward Yahweh. There is reason to suppose that this form of the response is due to a later writer, who wished to make the prophecy conform to the event. Originally the response must have been such as to encourage the king with the hope that the door of repentance was still open. The energy with which the king went to work to enforce the commands of the

¹ Some suppose that it was such a subterfuge.

book shows that he had such a hope. But hope is what is cut off by the response as now worded.

If anything was to be done it must be done at once. An assembly of notables was therefore called without delay. The king took his stand on the raised platform—the one which he regularly occupied in observing the ritual. He first read the book; then speaking for himself and as representative of the people, he registered a vow that they would carry out the ordinances and commands therein contained. All who were present “stood to the covenant” probably by a solemn *Amen*. The zeal of the quickened consciences made itself manifest in the immediate destruction of whatever in the Temple savoured of idolatry.

The work did not stop at the Temple. The details are worth noticing as showing how much of heathenism was extant in Judah, a part of it imported by Manasseh, but the most of it claiming great antiquity. A beginning was made with the Ashera—the sacred pole which had stood by the altar of Yahweh from time immemorial. Of its origin and purpose we are in ignorance. Until this time it seems not to have been obnoxious to the religious leaders except as they rejected the whole machinery of worship. Now the people became suddenly enlightened and cut it down. It was brought out to the Kidron valley and burned, and the ashes were scattered on the graves of the common people.¹ These graves were of course “unclean,” and the sacredness of the ancient emblem inhering even in its ashes could be effectually destroyed only in some such way as this. Next the people tore down the chambers of the *Qedeshim*, the ministers to unnatural lust, which are mentioned in connection with the Temple in the time of Asa.² Our historian then mentions the High-places—the ancient sanctuaries outside Jerusalem so often alluded to with disapproval. These country sanctuaries were attacked from Geba to Beersheba—that is, from the northern to the southern boundary of Judah—and destroyed. Their venerable character may be realised when we recall the story of the consecration of Beersheba by Abraham and Isaac. The altars were destroyed, but as these sanctuaries were dedicated *bona fide* to Yahweh, their priests

¹ 2 Kings, 23. The account is over-full, owing to later expansion. Verse⁶ seems to join directly to v.³.

² 1 Kings, 15¹² Asa's reform, whatever it may have been, was evidently temporary.

were brought to Jerusalem and enrolled in the staff of the Temple. The king's intention to put them on a par with the regular Temple priesthood was foiled by the opposition of the latter, who found possession nine points of the law. Our account says the country priests did not go up to the altar though they ate unleavened cakes among their brethren. This means that they formed a second and inferior order of priests.¹

Next came a thorough cleaning up in the vicinity of Jerusalem. The altar in the valley of Hinnom, just under the city walls—notorious as the place where children were sacrificed to Moloch—was thoroughly desecrated in order to put an end to this horrid rite.² In the gate of the Temple was a building for the horses sacred to the sun, “which the kings of Judah had consecrated.” The horses were taken away, and the chariots which were consecrated to the same service were destroyed. The roof altars of which we have heard in connexion with Ahaz and Manasseh, were carried away and dumped in the Kedron valley. Solomon's sanctuaries erected to the various gods of his subjects, and designed to secure their favour, could not escape the fate of the others. So great was the king's zeal that he went beyond his own proper territory and overthrew the celebrated altar at Bethel.³ That these proceedings did not evoke protest and opposition cannot be supposed, though the wholesale slaughter of priests of which we read at the close of the account, seems to be the invention of a later time.

To show that the reform was not to be merely negative, the king ordered the observance of the Passover, “according to what is written in this Book of the Covenant.” It is startling to read that no passover like this had been observed from the

¹ The precarious nature of their tenure is described by an author of about this time who sends to Eli (representative of these priests of the *Bamoth*) a message to the effect that his descendants will beg the priest of their day to give them employment for a piece of bread (1 Sam. 2³⁶).

² That Moloch was identified in the popular mind with Yahweh the king (Melech) must be conceded. The sacrifice of a son by Ahaz, and also by Manasseh, has already come under our notice. Had these been intended for a foreign god the fact would probably have been noted. Compare Professor Moore's article “Molech” in the *Encycl. Biblica*.

³ This seems to be asserted in the original account. A later hand has found in this incident the fulfilment of a prophecy made to Jeroboam I. And another supplementer has given into Josiah's hand all the sanctuaries of all Samaria (2 Kings, 23¹⁹).

days of the Judges. What the author means is that a passover such as is enjoined in the just found book was something new. A religious festival of some kind at, or near, the vernal equinox, seems to belong to primitive Semitic religion. What it was that made it seem a new observance is part of a larger inquiry to which we must now address ourselves—can we identify the Book of Instruction, which here enters into the history, and which had so marked an effect on king and people?

If the book has survived, it must be found within the bounds of the Pentateuch. For this is the only part of the Hebrew Bible which contains statutes and ordinances such as are here described. We may be sure, however, that it was not the whole of these five books, though the Jews call these the Book of Instruction still. It is doubtful whether in the early time these were ever written on a single roll—the division into five is decisive testimony to the size of an ancient book. Moreover, this is too large a book to be read through at a sitting, nor could it be read aloud twice or thrice in a single day. The account implies a book in which threatenings are prominent and calculated to make a vivid impression at once. For these reasons it has long been held that the Book of Instruction must be some part of the book which we call Deuteronomy. It can hardly be the whole of that book, for this shows traces of later expansion. The central chapters, what we may call the kernel of the book, culminating in the great chapter of blessings and curses—the twenty-eighth—is precisely the book to answer all the requirements. It is eminently a book of instruction; it contains statutes and ordinances; it can be read in a short time; it is written in the style of the personal appeal, such as must go to the heart of an impressionable hearer; it contains repeated threats of judgment, and ends with a frightful denunciation of Yahweh's curse upon those who disobey. Nothing could be more impressive to the religious mind than this concluding denunciation:

“But if thou dost not listen to the voice of Yahweh thy God, then all these curses shall come upon thee and overtake thee: Cursed shalt thou be in the city and cursed in the country; cursed shall be thy basket and thy bread bowl; cursed the fruit of thy body and the fruit of thy ground; the fruit of thy kine and thy ewes; cursed shalt thou be in thy coming and in thy going; Yahweh will send upon thee curse and confusion and evil

spell in whatever thou putteth thy hand to, till thou be destroyed. The heavens over thy head shall become copper, and the earth under thy feet shall become iron. Yahweh will change the rain of thy land to sand and dust. Yahweh will let thee be smitten before thine enemy—thou wilt go out before him one way but flee before him seven ways; and thou shalt become an object of abuse to all the nations of the earth. The stranger who sojourns as a client with thee shall keep rising above thee, while thou art sinking lower and lower. He will lend to thee but thou wilt not be able to lend to him.¹ All these curses shall come upon thee and follow thee and overtake thee until thou art destroyed, because thou hast not hearkened to Yahweh thy God, to keep His commandments and His statutes which He commanded thee; and they shall be signs and portents in thee and in thy seed for ever.”

When we remember the extraordinary power which a curse has—and especially a written curse—upon the minds of men at a certain stage of religious development, we can understand how these sentences affected the young king. What is now our chief concern is to notice that the book which contains these curses is exactly the book required by the conditions of our narrative. The evidence becomes very strong when we compare the reforms made by Josiah with the demands of the book before us.² The predominant purpose of the author is to do away with the religious errors of Judah, by concentrating all public worship at the one sanctuary in Jerusalem. The ancient sanctuaries had remained in honour among the people ever since the settlement in Canaan. The Baal there worshipped had become fully identified with the God of Israel. But their Canaanitish origin was still manifest to the reflecting mind, as we see in the classic example

¹ The tyranny exercised by the creditor over the debtor in the East, which gives point to this clause, is abundantly illustrated in the Bible. I may remark that in this quotation (Deut. 28¹⁵⁻²⁰, 23-25, 43-46) I am giving only what the most recent commentator designates as part of the original book.

² I mean the original Book of Deuteronomy, which contained at any rate chapters 12-19, 26 and 28 of the present book. A composition of this kind easily lends itself to expansion, and many hands have been busy in making the book as we now have it. The reader may consult Driver's volume in the *International Critical Commentary*, the article of Professor Moore in the *Encyclopedia Biblica*, Carpenter and Battersby in their volumes on *The Hexateuch* (1900), and the commentaries of Steuernagel and Bertholet.

of Hosea. The prophets and their pupils were advancing in the knowledge of Yahweh, and the old nature worship, though offered to Him, was become repulsive to them. The author of the new book proposed a novel remedy—that the worship of the one God should be limited to one sanctuary. This stands at the head of his commands and ordinances: “You must not do as we do to-day, every one what he thinks good. . . . Beware lest thou bring thy burnt offerings at every sanctuary that thou seest. Only at the place which Yahweh shall choose in one of thy tribes shalt thou bring thy burnt offerings, and perform all that I command thee.” The chapter repeats this exhortation to redundancy.¹ It was something that needed to be emphasised, if it were to be carried through. The intention is to abrogate the earlier permission to build altars *at every place* where Yahweh revealed Himself,² and the language is purposely chosen to show this. The author is not unmindful of the practical difficulties that will arise, and he makes provision for them.³

The main purpose of the book, therefore, was carried out in the reforms of Josiah. The old sanctuaries were thoroughly destroyed, though so far as they were recognised as belonging to Yahweh their priests were brought to Jerusalem—which also is specifically provided in the book.⁴

The opposition between Yahweh and the other gods was known in Israel from a very early time. Elijah had energetically preached that fidelity to Yahweh excluded the worship of Baal, and in this all the prophets had agreed. But the Deuteronomist is the first to make this principle the basis of severe practical regulations. He commands specifically that any Israelite who entices to the worship of any god but Yahweh shall be put to death. He shall not be spared—he shall be delivered over—by his nearest kin. His crime shall not be condoned, even in the face of the most remarkable prodigies wrought in his favour. Like-

¹ Deut. 12^{8, 13}; notice also vv. 18, 26.

² Ex. 20²⁴.

³ The permission to slay animals for food elsewhere than at an altar, was necessitated by the limitation of the sanctuaries to one. It was hardly less startling than the first regulation. Up to this date it is probable that every act of slaying an animal for food was an act of sacrifice.

⁴ “When a Levite comes from any of thy towns where he lives as a client, he may come as he desires to the place which Yahweh shall choose—he shall have the same portion”—18^{6f}.

wise the Israelite city which tolerates the worship of any but the one God of Israel is to be put to the sword, and all that is in it—human beings and property—is to be utterly destroyed.¹

The effect of these directions is seen in Josiah's measures in the Temple. The state policy of Ahaz and Manasseh had crowded this building with other gods. Now these had to go—the roof altars erected to the planets and constellations, the horses of the sun at the entrance to the court. The old Solomonic sanctuaries in the city or its suburbs could not escape. The hatred of idolatrous symbols was extended by the Deuteronomist to the *ashera* and *maçgeba*, which had been accepted as innocent accompaniments of the altar of Yahweh from early times.² Very likely they were Canaanitish in origin, in which case the proscription is intelligible.³ It was effective in that it secured the destruction of the *ashera* in the Temple as already recounted. It is scarcely necessary to call attention to the prohibition of child sacrifice and of necromancers, or to the king's measures based thereon.⁴ The Passover, however, should have a moment's attention. What makes the festival a new festival is the command that it shall be observed (being a sacrifice) at the place which Yahweh shall choose, and the prohibition of its observance in any other place. The nomad sacrifice of the firstlings of the flock had been a household festival observed by each family in its own home. This is clear from the custom of sprinkling or smearing the blood on each doorway. Now it is made a great national ceremony. The men of Israel must all appear at Jerusalem and there alone may the lamb be slain, "in the place which Yahweh shall choose, to make His name dwell there."⁵ It is as if the American Thanksgiving from being a family reunion festival should be changed to a great pilgrimage to some national sanctuary. It would be practically a new observance. This is what the author of Kings means by the Passover's not having been observed for centuries.

¹ Chapter 13 is devoted to this subject.

² The simplest explanation of these much discussed objects is that the *ashera* represents the sacred tree, while the *maçgeba* is the old stone fetish of which we have a plain example in Jacob's consecration of Bethel (Gen. 28¹¹⁻²²).

³ The author is not content with directing the destruction of Canaanitish pillars and poles, but forbids their erection at the altar of Yahweh (Deut. 16^{21f}).

⁴ Deut. 18^{10f}, compare 2 Kings, 23²⁴.

⁵ Deut., 16¹⁻⁸.

These considerations are sufficient to show that the Book of Deuteronomy (in its earliest form) was the book found by Hilkiah. It is possible we may even recover from it the form of the covenant entered into at the sacred assembly called by the king: "Thou hast declared Yahweh this day to be thy God, so as to walk in His ways and to keep His statutes and His judgments, and to listen to His voice. And Yahweh has declared thee this day to be His own people."¹

It remains to inquire how so timely a book came to be in the place where it could accomplish the most good. On this point we have no direct information, but we may be allowed a conjecture that has some probability. Such a book must have originated with the prophetic party, and it probably originated during the times of persecution under Manasseh. The men who, in the time of Hezekiah, had hoped and worked for religious reform, were later debarred (as we have seen) from public activity. That they would naturally turn to literature we have already conjectured. Isaiah himself had a circle of disciples with whom he left the written monuments of his activity.² Secret societies have always existed in the East, and such a society would be the natural result of Manasseh's severity. We may imagine the little company of earnest men feeding their souls, during those evil days, on the written word. Nor would they content themselves with a life of silent contemplation. The strong faith that a better day was coming would lead them to plan for its coming. One or more of them would be moved to put on record a programme for the future. That it should contemplate more radical reforms than those instituted by Hezekiah is only what we should expect.

The idea most strongly borne in upon this company of faithful men was that the popular religion was of Canaanitish origin. This was not only a theological deduction from the idea of Yahweh's righteousness, and from the discord between this and what went on at the sanctuaries. It had historical justification and it had been preached by the earlier prophets—most distinctly by Hosea. The people might call the *genius loci* of any particular High-place by the name Yahweh. Nevertheless, they were worshipping a Baal. The root of all Israel's evils was this amalga-

¹ Deut. 26 17-19.

² "I will bind up the admonition and seal the instruction among my disciples"—Is. 8 16 (Cheyne).

mation between them and the Canaanites. The only way in which the evils could have been avoided was by the extermination of the older inhabitants of the land. The author finds a drastic way of expressing this, when, putting himself in the place of Israel's venerable lawgiver, he commands not only the complete destruction of all Canaanitish objects of religion, but the extermination of the Canaanites themselves. They are to be "devoted"—an act which compels a complete destruction.¹ If such a policy of *thorough* shocks us, we may remember that its advocates had the example of Manasseh before their eyes.

It was not the old Baal worship alone that wearied the souls of these faithful men. Survivals in the time of Ezekiel show that the primitive totemism was found even in the Temple. The partisans of Egypt had introduced the pantheon of that country. The Assyrian gods introduced by Ahaz may have been banished by Hezekiah, but they had returned in full force under Manasseh. Jeremiah describes the whole population engaged in a festival to the Queen of Heaven—probably the Babylonian Ishtar—whose consort or paramour, Tammuz, was bewailed by the women even in the Temple courts down to the last days of Jerusalem.² The sun worship indicated by the horses and chariots already noticed, is also described by Ezekiel. We cannot wonder that men who had absorbed Hosea's idea of Israel's exclusive relation to Yahweh,³ should be both indignant and sick at heart. If Yahweh was Israel's husband, who had cared for her in the past, who had led her through the wilderness, who had given her the land of Canaan, filling her heart with food and gladness—if at the same time He was a jealous God, not tolerating rivals or partners⁴—then it was plain that Israel (now represented by Judah) was in a per-

¹ Deut. 20 16-18. What this devotion or ban (Hebrew *herem*) means is set forth in the story of Jericho and its conquest in the book of Joshua. Such a religious act is not uncommon in early warfare.

² Jer. 7 17, which describes the worship of the Queen of Heaven, seems to belong in the reign of Josiah. Stade's ingenious endeavour to show that the Host of Heaven is meant, has not met with general acceptance. On Tammuz (the Adonis of Greek myth) see Ezek. 8 14.

³ The figure of a marriage is a staple in the preaching of Jeremiah and of Ezekiel.

⁴ The earliest assertion that Yahweh is a jealous God seems to be in J—Ex. 34 14. In the earlier time—before Elijah at any rate—the people seem to have worshipped many Gods without consciousness of offending Yahweh.

ilous position. The Deuteronomist, or his successor, who formulated the faith of these men gave Judaism, Christianity, and Islam their common basis: "Yahweh thy God, is one; and thou shalt love Yahweh thy God, with all thy mind, and with all thy being, and with all thy strength." ¹

This is not a speculative monotheism which is asserted. The author's motive is moral and practical. The nations may have their gods—for Israel there can be but one. Whole-souled devotion to Him is the basis of national life and the condition of national prosperity. Hence the sweeping and cruel measures advocated against the Canaanites as against all renegade Israelites. The requirement of a single sanctuary is the logical sequence. What had confused the people as to the unity of their God was the multiplicity of holy places. The Baal of any particular holy place was the presiding genius of that locality. The change of name from Baal to Yahweh did not change the theory of the worshippers. In the mind of the common man the Yahweh of Beersheba, the Yahweh of Hebron, and the Yahweh of Bethel were so many local divinities. The only remedy for this inveterate polytheism of the people was the restriction to a single sanctuary.

So radical a measure could not be advocated unless there were special circumstances favouring it. We may count as one of these the prophetic tradition concerning ritual. We have felt the scorn which Amos, Hosea, and Isaiah poured upon the popular service of Yahweh. As they saw it going on—luxurious, lascivious, uniting drunkenness with injustice and oppression—they could feel only abhorrence for it. Such a service was an abomination to Yahweh. The less of such a service the people had the better it would be for them—to obey is better than to sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams.

To abolish ritual altogether was seen to be impossible. But it was thought possible to regulate it. At a single sanctuary in the capital city, under the eye of the king, with adequate police supervision, the worship might be shorn of its abuses. The three great annual festivals would be often enough for the people to appear before Yahweh. Thus the traditional worship would be conserved. Nor would there be any hardship involved in such pilgrimages. The extent of Judah was small. A day's journey

¹ Deut. 6 4f, cf. 10 12-15. The verses may not be by the earliest Deuteronomist, but they express the principle of the school in the most perfect form.

would be all that would be required of the most remote citizen. Such a journey would have advantages of its own in the way of trade and acquaintance, and the festival would gain, rather than lose, in importance by being the occasion of a formal pilgrimage.

If there were to be a single sanctuary, it must be at Jerusalem. The Temple had been at first no more than the king's sanctuary, receiving a certain prestige from its connexion with the court. Solomon himself had recognised the importance of the High-places in making his pilgrimage to Gibeon. But, as time went on, the Temple grew in importance. The priests attached to it had the means of making its service attractive and imposing. Isaiah held the sanctuary to be the residence of Yahweh.¹ In his time it had received a signal proof of the divine favour, for it had been protected when most of the sanctuaries were captured and sacked by the Assyrians. The failure of Sennacherib to take Jerusalem was read as proof of the inviolability of Yahweh's earthly seat. There could be no doubt where He should be worshipped—if at one place, it must be here.

The course of reflection which gave the Deuteronomist his leading ideas is thus tolerably clear to us. For the form in which he presented them we should notice that a great name of the past was almost essential to the success of the programme. To put the ideas on parchment as a bald programme of reform would be to invite failure from the start. The people at large were impervious to logic or theology in abstract form. But the name of Moses would appeal to them. This name was already familiar as that of the founder of their religion. Tradition already ascribed to him the regulation of the social order and the establishment of a covenant between Yahweh and Israel. The social and religious ordinances already attributed to him might be repeated in a form adequate to the times, and expanded by the inclusion of the reforms the author had so much at heart.

The conception which the Deuteronomist had of his own work, therefore, was this: He would, in the name of Moses, remodel the constitution of Moses and adapt it to his own time. The character which he thus assumed allowed him to express his own personality, with its wealth of affection for Israel, and its depth of abhorrence for heathenism. It enabled him to speak with authority, and to appeal, on the ground of tradition, to the best

¹As we see from his inaugural vision (Is. 6).

impulses of those who should read or hear his book. In carrying out his plan he allowed himself to embody in his code those moral principles which the whole prophetic school had so much at heart. He is never weary of urging justice to the oppressed, charity for the needy, kindness to the dependent. He does not content himself with general exhortations, but points out the specific occasions on which acts of kindness may be best exercised. He urges this on the ground of Israel's own experience in the past, as well as on the ground of Yahweh's will in the matter. That he appeals to utilitarian motives is what we might expect. Obedience will be accompanied by temporal prosperity, disobedience will be followed by calamity. That his love for his own people co-exists with a demand for the most ruthless measures against foreigners¹ shows how easily narrowness may be found in the most benevolent heart.

The space we have devoted to the Book of Instruction is justified by its importance in Old Testament history. Politically, the action taken by Josiah was a new departure—practically nothing less than the adoption of a written constitution for the people. Whatever "Mosaic" codes had existed before were compendiums for private use. Now the whole nation bound itself in the most solemn manner to abide by certain fixed regulations. That these were religious as well as civil is quite in accord with ancient thought. The distinction of church and state was quite unknown in Israel, as it is unknown in Islam to-day. The church, in fact, was the state. But the adoption of a book as the basis of a community (whether we call it church or state) was an act of far-reaching importance.

The immediate effects were, of course, various in kind. Some minds must have been repelled rather than attracted by the endeavour to put the transcendent will of Yahweh into a series of rules. The letter killeth, the Spirit giveth life, would be their impression. It is possible that we may find a representative of these more spiritually minded believers in Jeremiah. This prophet must have known the book. It was published not many years after he began to preach. His language constantly shows its influence or the influence of its ideas. And yet he makes no

¹ The author's exhortations in favour of the *stranger* (as we have it in our version) include only the stranger who has entered into relations of clientage with Israel.

direct and clear allusion to it. If he alludes to it at all, it is with an implication against it.¹ The strong affirmation of Yahweh's covenant with the people, which is made by Jeremiah in common with Deuteronomy, is used by him to show that the defection of Judah is beyond amendment. By the law is the knowledge of sin. The attempt to put God's requirements into words shows how far short we are of the standard.

No doubt more practical minds found satisfaction in the new code. Here at last was something clear-cut and definite. The exhortations of the prophets to justice and kindness and the knowledge of God had been irritating from their vagueness. Now the exhortations were translated into commands. Yahweh's will was now set forth in black and white. He meant to have them destroy the High-places, to do away with the ashera, to come to Jerusalem three times a year. No doubt the result was to encourage obedience to these specific commands. But the result was also to encourage formalism and self-righteousness. And the danger of a reaction was not distant. The promise of earthly prosperity on condition of obedience was calculated to foster extravagant hopes. Should disappointment come, the conclusions that would be drawn are obvious. It is possible that Josiah himself was the victim of false hopes.

We cannot leave this subject without noticing that the actual effect of the adoption of the Book was to bring to an end the very institution that it was meant to establish. What stands out clearly is that the author desired to strengthen and enforce the authority of the prophets. He himself was a man of prophetic spirit and aims. His composition is a prophetic oration. He regarded Moses as only the first of a long line of inspired men, to follow whom would make Israel's happiness. He embodied in the Book an explicit promise that Yahweh would raise up a succession of such leaders. In each generation there would be a mediator between man and God, who should be instructed in the mind of God and convey it to the people, even as Moses stood between the theophanic fire and the nation whom he was leading.

¹ Jer. 8⁸ is sometimes supposed to be a reference to Deuteronomy, in which case Jeremiah condemned the book because it enabled the people to say they had the instruction of Yahweh, and consequently did not need that of the prophet. The reference, however, is hardly certain enough to build upon.

It is easy to see the author's expectation that this line of inspired instructors is to continue as long as Israel shall be a people.¹ The author could not foresee that the adoption of a written revelation would do away with the necessity of the directly inspired leader. Yet such was the outcome. If Moses, the greatest of the prophets, left the revealed will of God in writing, why another prophet? If the additional revelation only confirmed the one already given, it would be needless. It is to be supposed that a scribe, a student of language, will be abundantly able to interpret and expound the sufficient revelation. We see how easily this conclusion was drawn, and how the adoption of Deuteronomy was the first step toward the triumph of legalism, and the supremacy of the Scribes.²

The triumph of legalism, however, was a long way from Josiah and his contemporaries. The immediate event was the triumph of the prophetic party. The religious zeal of the nation was aroused and the cultus was reformed for the time being. Probably also there was some good done by the new-found exhortations to justice, kindness, and sobriety. If we may judge by the condition in which the book has come down to us, it was circulated in various editions, expanded by scribes who were in sympathy with its purpose. Some of these improvers inserted additional regulations, drawing upon established custom, or making the new commands more distinct. Some of them expanded the hortatory portions and enforced the lessons of the wilderness wandering. Our present copy seems to combine two or more of these enlarged editions and was further added to when it was fitted into its place in the Pentateuch.

Habit is often stronger than any fit of enthusiasm—it has at least more staying power. Religious usage is naturally tenacious of life. The forbidden sanctuaries must of necessity still hold a place in the regard of the people. The forbidden practices could not at once be forgotten, nor could the king's command make odious that which the people had cherished from

¹ Compare Driver's remarks, in his *Commentary*, on Deut. 18¹⁵⁻²².

² On Jeremiah's attitude toward Deuteronomy, compare Carpenter and Battersby, *The Hexateuch*, I, p. 90. On the Babylonian worship of the sun, the third edition of Schrader's *Keilinschriften und Altes Testament*, p. 367, and on the Queen of Heaven, alluded to above, the same work, p. 441.

their youth. According to Jeremiah, the people's heart was still uncircumcised and their guilty desires still went out to other gods. His book gives no indication that the reform showed any real fruits.¹

The little kingdom of Judah was thus setting its house in order according to its lights. The great outside world meanwhile was in commotion. Ashurbanipal, the last great king of Assyria, died not long before the time when the Book of Instruction was to create so profound an impression in Judah. Already the cloud was upon the horizon which should break upon Nineveh and overwhelm it. The wanderers of the far northern steppes had begun one of those great migrations which have changed the face of the world. The Scythians²—a nomad race—overran the empire. Beginning with Media, they swept along to the south till they reached the border of Egypt, where they are said to have refrained from invasion in consideration of a heavy money payment. They ravaged the country far and wide, and although unable to conduct a regular siege, they reduced many of the walled towns by starvation. We are imperfectly informed of their numbers and of their separate campaigns. Herodotus says that they scourged Assyria twenty-eight years. The terror which the report of them produced in Palestine may be read in Jeremiah's description :

“Cry with full voice and say: Assemble and come to the walled towns! Lift up a signal in Zion, make haste, delay not! For I am bringing evil from the north and a great calamity. A lion has gone up from his lair, and a destroyer of nations has started forth. He has come out of his place to make thy land a desolation; thy cities shall be destroyed without inhabitant. . . . Behold, like clouds they come; their chariots are like the whirlwind; swifter than eagles are their horses. Woe to us, for we are destroyed! . . . I look at the earth, and lo, ut-

¹ Caution is necessary here, as Jeremiah did not write down any of his prophecies (so we may understand the account in chapter 36) until the fourth year of Jehoiakim. The written copy may be more denunciatory than was the spoken word. Still it is strange that he should not refer to the evanescent revival if he approved of it at all.

² For a description of them, cf. Rawlinson's *Ancient Monarchies*, II, p. 223 ff. On their invasion Duff, *Old Testament Theology*, II, p. 17 ff. Though Aryans by race (as it seems), they may be aptly compared to the Tartar hordes which overran the East in the Middle Age.

ter confusion! At the sky—and it gives no light. I look at the mountains and they are quaking; and all the hills reel to and fro. I look and there is no man—even the birds have flown away. I look, and the garden land has become a wilderness, and all its cities are overthrown before Yahweh, before His hot anger.”¹

We have also an interesting document from the same period in the little book of Zephaniah, a descendant of King Hezekiah.² Here we see the invasion pictured as the great Day of Yahweh, which the prophets so often have in mind. Specifically threatened are the Philistine cities, which we know to have suffered severely. The harm done to Assyria is also in the prophet's mind, though he does not picture its fall so vividly as does his successor Nahum. His declaration of the need of reform in Judah is, however, as striking as anything in Jeremiah.³ Our chronology is here uncertain, but it may be that these prophecies, with the near approach of the Scythians, stimulated the people in carrying out the reforms of Josiah.

This time Judah was spared. The scourge of God fell heavily upon her neighbours, but the anticipation of immediate judgment for Judah was not fulfilled. The invasion was in fact to her benefit, for the Assyrian empire was so weakened that it could no longer oppress its remote dependency. Nor was it the Scythians alone that now pressed upon Nineveh. To the east a new power had arisen in Media, a kingdom which was strong enough to attempt the siege of Nineveh even before the Scythian invasion.⁴ This siege was indeed unsuccessful, for the Median king (Cyaxares) was compelled to look to his defences, now threatened by the barbarian irruption. But this was only a temporary diversion. As soon as the pressing exigency was met, he returned to his plans. Assyria had lost both strength and prestige. Its most important dependency Babylon, always unruly,

¹ Jer. 4⁵⁻²⁶. Undoubtedly when Jeremiah wrote down this prophecy he was thinking of the invasion by Nebuchadrezzar, then impending. But the occasion of the prophet's first speaking the passage was the Scythian irruption, and the description draws its colours from this event.

² So it is natural to interpret the opening verse of the book (Zeph. 1¹).

³ Zeph. 3¹⁻⁷ is evidently directed against Jerusalem, but the rest of the chapter is of a different tenor and must be of later date.

⁴ It may not have come to an actual siege—see Wellhausen on Nahum, 1⁹, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, V, p. 156.

had also seized its opportunity. Nabopolassar, the Assyrian viceroy, elevated himself to the throne and made an alliance with the Medes. The alliance was cemented by the marriage of a daughter of Cyaxares to the crown prince Nebuchadrezzar. A simultaneous attack was made upon Assyria, and after a prolonged siege Nineveh fell. The city was so completely destroyed that its location was for many centuries forgotten.¹

The feelings with which the people in Jerusalem saw this tragedy enacted are well set forth by the prophet Nahum. We seem to read the words of an eye-witness in this vivid description—the great city is thrown into confusion at the approach of the enemy, the streets are filled with troops mustering for defence; the horses gallop, the chariots rattle over the pavements, their wheels strike fire; the foot-soldiers with their red shields man the walls. But all is in vain. The defences are stormed, the palace is plundered, the queen herself is carried away in the midst of her attendants—dishevelled, sobbing, beating their breasts in despair. The city is given over to sack, her enormous treasures fall into the hands of the invaders. The old lion who plundered all the world for his cubs, who strangled right and left for his lionesses—now his lair is invaded, he and his cubs are slain. The mighty city is destroyed, the multitudes that boasted in her strength and riches have flown like the locusts which lodge in the hedges in swarms at night, but when the sun gets warm take their flight and leave no trace behind.²

There is, however, more here than the natural joy of the Judæite over the impending destruction of the great oppressor. The prophets had taken pains to declare that Yahweh moves these great nations for His own purposes. And these purposes must be purposes of justice which His Day will declare. Isaiah was sure that when the Assyrian had accomplished the commission of the Holy One of Israel, he in turn would receive his reward. Isaiah was at last vindicated. Assyria had long served as the

¹ The exact date of the fall of Nineveh is not yet ascertained. The years 607 and 606 B.C., both have their advocates. Cf. the paper by Johnston in the *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, xxii., 2, p. 20 ff.

² Nahum 2 and 3. The text is uncertain in places, but the general sense is plain; cf. Nowack in the *Handkommentar*, and Wellhausen in the *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*. A free rendering of the book is given by Duff, *Old Testament Theology*, II, pp. 31-35.

rod in Yahweh's hand, but now the instrument was itself punished. So we must understand Nahum's opening sentences:

"Yahweh is a jealous and avenging God. He meditates vengeance on His enemies, and He plots against His adversaries. Yahweh is patient and of great strength, but He will not leave unpunished. In storm and whirlwind is His path, and the clouds are the dust of His feet."¹

The God of History is showing Himself to be a just God—this is the conviction of the prophetic school. And we can see how the dominant party in Jerusalem under Josiah would draw a conclusion favourable to their policy. It was shortly after the great reform (we may suppose) when these messages came, giving assurance of the downfall of Nineveh. The people of Yahweh had been spared by the Scythians; now they were to see the end of Assyria. What more evident than that their God was smiling on their observance of His commands as laid down in the Book of Instruction! Jeremiah, indeed, was of another opinion. He set small store by the people's obedience, and apparently saw nothing hopeful in the fall of Nineveh. He still harped upon justice and righteousness, forbade oppression and fraud, hinted or asserted that Judah was worse than the sister kingdom whose sins had been so signally punished a hundred years before. He even went so far as to rebuke the people's trust in the Temple, and declared that Yahweh would be as ready to destroy this dwelling-place as he had been to destroy the older temple at Shiloh—whose ruins near the great north road might still be seen by the curious traveller.²

In all this, the pessimistic preacher seems to have stood alone. His nearest friends were out of patience with him, so that Yahweh warned him of the machinations of his own family. To all appearance his clan had resolved to get rid of him by treachery and violence. Doubtless it seemed too bad that after all that had been done to meet the will of Yahweh this Cassandra-voice would not be quiet. There was consolation in the thought that this was the only one—a chorus of prophets applauded king and people, and pronounced that all was going well. The mass of

¹ Nahum, i 2, 3.

² Jer. 7 4-15. It is difficult to fix the exact date of these earlier chapters of Jeremiah, but this discourse must have been pronounced at a time when the people had special occasion to feel confidence in their sanctuary.

the people were of the opinion that Yahweh was again smiling upon them. It was natural that Josiah himself should share their view, and it is not difficult on this theory to account for the act by which he lost his life.

When the fall of Nineveh was seen to be near at hand a new-old world-power appeared upon the scene. Egypt had been under the rule of Assyria and had had a period of division and weakness. But a new dynasty had asserted itself, its founder being Psammetich I., a Libyan soldier who saw the capabilities of Greek mercenaries, with whose help he made himself master of the country.¹ His own exploits were confined to his proper territory and he was even compelled to pay a heavy tribute to keep the Scythians from invading the country. But his son Necho, who came next to the throne, was more fortunate, or more ambitious. In fact, it was inevitable that an Egyptian King when once secure of his position should inherit traditions of Asiatic conquest. The moment seemed favourable for extending the power of Egypt over Syria—Syria which had so often been under Egyptian suzerainty. Assyria was moribund; its estate was about to be divided. Necho did not know—and if he had known might not have cared—that Babylon claimed the southern and western provinces, allowing Media to possess the north and east.

Possession would be a strong point in Necho's favour. In the year 608 B. C., therefore, he marched into Palestine on the way to secure for himself all Syria as far as the Euphrates. Josiah opposed him and was killed. The Hebrew account says that the battle took place at Megiddo in the Great Plain. This was outside Josiah's proper territory, and if the account is accurate we must suppose that Josiah was called into service with other princes of the region by the Assyrian governor. Even then it would have been better to choose more defensible ground farther south.² The difficulty is met if we suppose the Hebrew writer to have confused Megiddo with some other name. Such a name is suggested by Herodotus, who speaks of Necho as defeating the Syrians at Magdolos. A Migdal, near the coast, which would

¹ His father had been governor of one of the districts into which the country was then divided. On this (the twenty-sixth) Egyptian dynasty, see Wiedemann, *Geschichte des Alten Aegyptens* (1891), p. 171 ff.

² If Necho (as some suppose), came by ship to Accho, he would hardly march by way of Megiddo to reach northern Syria.

meet all the requirements, is located by the book of Joshua in the territory of Judah not far from the Philistine border.¹

Josiah's motive for the attack is not given. We may suppose that he was loyal to the Assyrian Empire and thought it his duty to defend it. In view of the consistent hatred of foreign nations held by the national party in Jerusalem this is hardly probable. The alternate theory has much to recommend it—that Josiah felt virtually independent of Assyria and had no mind to be brought under the control of Egypt. Strongly under the influence of the Book of Instruction, and persuaded that he had carried out its directions, he looked for the favour of Yahweh, and thought this favour must follow him in any encounter with the enemies of Judah. He may have gone farther in his confidence and ambition. Traditions of David's great empire would naturally arouse in him a desire to restore the ancestral glories of his house.

Few instances in history are better calculated to enforce the lesson that God's thoughts are not our thoughts, nor His ways man's ways. When the two armies met, Josiah was slain by the archers—in the preliminary skirmish, it would seem—and his officers brought the body to Jerusalem, where it was placed in the sepulchre which he himself had prepared.² The grief of the people was intense, and to all appearances universal. Whatever the limitations of the king may have been, his righteousness and devotion had won the respect of all. Three hundred years later his death was the subject of folk-songs.³ The mourning was unabated some months after the sad event, as we learn from Jeremiah.⁴ From the same source we learn that Josiah was a just ruler, for the prophet contrasts his conduct with that of Jehoiakim: "Did not thy father eat and drink and act justly and rightly? Then it went well with him. He judged the cause of the poor and the needy—then it was well. Is not this to know me? saith Yah-

¹ Josh. 15 ³⁷, where the name is given as Migdal-gad. The statement of Herodotus is found in II, 159. Winckler's statement (*Geschichte Israels*, I, 163 f.) is convincing. Landau (*Die Phönizier* p. 14) locates the battle at Strato's Tower, the site of the New Testament Cesarea, on the coast.

² 2 Kings, 23 ²⁹ f.

³ The Chronicler must have some ground for his assertion that "the singing men and singing women have spoken of Josiah in their elegies up to the present time" (2 Chr. 35 ²⁵).

⁴ "Weep not for the dead, neither bemoan him; but weep sore for him that goeth away"—Jehoahaz is meant (Jer. 22 ^{10, 16}).

weh." Such language from the sternest moralist of the time is high praise. It is made more emphatic by the fact that Jeremiah never speaks with approval of the great religious reform on which Josiah laid so much stress.

The rash act of Josiah, and his consequent death, brought his kingdom into the vicissitudes of external politics. Pharaoh Necho, it would seem, was willing, for the time being, to leave Judah in quiet while he was securing more remote districts. Now that Josiah had forced the issue, notice must be taken of the succession. During the next few years the struggle between Egypt and Babylon repeated the struggle of a century earlier between Egypt and Assyria, and Judah was a mere counter in the game, in one case as in the other. The people's misery was increased, not only by the heavy tribute exacted by whichever master held the power, but by internal discord and by the vacillating policy of their kings. These kings also left much to be desired in their personal character. Two of them reigned so short a time as to make no impression. Of the other two, one was a selfish and luxurious despot, the other a man of no strength of character—a mere figure-head in the court, altogether subservient to his corrupt and short-sighted officers.

On the death of Josiah (B.C. 608) the popular choice fell upon his second son, Shallum, who assumed the name Jehoahaz on ascending the throne. What principles were involved, or what was the motive for passing over the older son, is not told. We may conjecture that the party of independence was able to put its candidate upon the throne. The Pharaoh, however, was in actual control of the situation, and had an observant eye on so important a fortress as Jerusalem. In his progress through Syria he seems to have met no effective opposition, and had already reached Ribla on the Orontes. Hither he summoned the newly elected king. An attempt to evade the summons would have been vain, and Jehoahaz obeyed—only to be thrown into chains by the angry over-lord. He was carried away to Egypt, and his older brother, Eliakim, was put on the throne. Necho changed his name to Jehoiakim, apparently as an affirmation that it was Yahweh who was really giving Judah into the hands of Egypt. The victory over Josiah was interpreted as a manifestation of the will of Judah's God—just as Sennacherib, at an earlier time, claimed the help of Yahweh as his justification in invading Judah.

In the further exercise of his sovereignty the Egyptian laid upon Judah a tribute of a hundred talents of silver and a talent of gold. This amount Jehoiakim collected by a direct tax.¹

All that we know of Jehoahaz is that his sad fate impressed both Jeremiah and Ezekiel.² Jehoiakim (607-597) received more attention, but not more favourable attention, from Jeremiah. At a time when his kingdom was impoverished by the exactions of Egypt, he was possessed by the royal mania for building. He was more concerned to vie with Ahab in the beauty of his palace, "panelled with cedar and painted with vermilion," than he was to follow his father's example in administering justice. He not only compelled the artisans to work for him without wages, but he set the example of selling justice—in no other way can we understand the accusation that he exploited his position for gain, and that his eyes were fixed only on shedding innocent blood, and on violence, and robbery.³ This mania looks like that which God sends upon the victims of destruction; and so Jeremiah regarded it.

The Egyptian predominance in Syria was short-lived. While the Babylonians and Medes were occupied in giving Nineveh the finishing stroke, Pharaoh Necho was able to accomplish his designs in the west. The various districts were taken in possession, one after the other, until the Euphrates was reached. But the Babylonians were not inclined to relinquish any rights. They were the heirs of Nineveh, except so far as they were bound by the agreement made with the Medes. Nabopolassar regarded himself, as by right of conquest, over-lord, not only of Syria, but of Egypt itself. The actual commander of the forces was Nebuchadrezzar, a prince of ability in more than one direction. The year after the fall of Nineveh he met the Egyptian army at Carchemish, on the Euphrates, and inflicted upon them a crushing

¹ The sum seems disproportionately divided between the two metals, and we should, perhaps, read *ten* talents of gold, with one recension of the Greek version. The passage is 2 Kings, 23³³. See Kittel in his commentary. The name Jehoiakim (Yahweh-establishes) may be a direct answer to the claim made in the name Jehoahaz (Yahweh-holds-fast).

² Jer. 22¹¹, Ezek. 19³⁻⁵.

³ Jer. 22¹⁸⁻¹⁹. Some slight changes in the text are necessary, for which the reader may consult Cornill's edition in Haupt's *Sacred Books of the Old Testament* (1895). Giesebrecht finds Solomon alluded to rather than Ahab (*Handkommentar*).

defeat. The date (B.C. 605) marks one of the turning points in the world's history.¹ By it Babylon established its claim to the Assyrian empire. Nebuchadrezzar followed up his success, receiving the submission of the Syrian states as far as the boundary of Egypt. He marched with his army throughout the whole territory, but when about to enter Egypt he received news of his father's death, and hastened by express the nearest way through the desert to Babylon.

The whole progress from Carchemish to Philistia occupied but a few months, and it was to be expected that so rapid a conquest would not be permanent. The Hebrew historian relates summarily as usual, saying only that in Jehoiakim's days "Nebuchadrezzar came up to Babylon and Jehoiakim became his servant for three years, then he turned and rebelled against him."² From a verse in Ezekiel it has been supposed that Jehoiakim voluntarily sent an embassy to vow allegiance to Nebuchadrezzar. He was, however, indebted to the Pharaoh for his crown in the first place and it is not strange that his secret preference was for his old master. The rebellion seems not to have been confined to Judah, but to have included a considerable number of Syrian states. They depended upon Egypt, which again proved to be a broken reed. The Hebrew narrative is again so brief as to be obscure: "The King of Egypt came no more forth from his land, for the King of Babylon had taken, from the Wadi of Egypt to the river Euphrates, all that belonged to the King of Egypt."³

It was when the first news of the approach of the Babylonians reached Jerusalem that Jeremiah renewed his warnings, predicting that Yahweh was about to destroy His city and Temple as He had laid Shiloh waste. To the hearers this seemed to be treason. The bold prophet was arrested by the priests and prophets and brought before the princes for judgment. The princes found precedent for releasing him, in the case of Micah, who had uttered a similar prophecy but had been spared by

¹ The battle must have taken place very early in the year; cf. Winckler *Alttestamentliche Untersuchungen*, p. 83.

² 2 Kings, 24¹. The chronological difficulties are set forth by Kittel in his commentary. McCurdy (*History, Prophecy, and the Monuments*, III, p. 167) supposes we should read *six* years for the *three* of the text.

³ 2 Kings, 24¹.

Hezekiah. Jeremiah was therefore released—he had influential friends as we know—but a man named Uriah who was of the same way of thinking was so threatened that he fled to Egypt. Jehoiakim's influence in Egypt was such that he was able to send for the offender and bring him back to Jerusalem, where he was executed. The incident throws light not only on the danger in which Jeremiah was from this time on, but on the strength of party feeling in Jerusalem.

The disorders in the Syrian states were so marked that Nebuchadrezzar established his headquarters at Riblah on the Orontes for several years. Not able to finish the guerilla war by a single blow he sent detachments of his army where the need was most evident. This method of procedure is indicated by the Hebrew author, who says that Nebuchadrezzar sent against Judah "bands of Chaldeans, bands of Aram, bands of Moab, bands of Ammon."¹ The bands of Chaldeans were regular Babylonian soldiers. The others were irregulars enlisted for this sort of service. The Bedawin doubtless gave the king much trouble, and he was obliged to employ the means which God and nature had put into his hands. Although not himself a cruel or vindictive man, it seemed to him legitimate thus to harry rebels into submission. At last, however, he was able to appear before Jerusalem with a regular army—or rather the army had already invested the city when the king appeared. Jehoiakim meanwhile had died and so escaped the vengeance he had merited. His son Jehoiachin was recognised as king by the Jerusalemites. But as Egypt made no move, the scarcely crowned monarch saw the necessity of surrender, and with his family gave himself unconditionally into the hands of the Babylonians.

The city was spared, but Jehoiachin was carried to Babylon, where he was kept in prison—or perhaps only under guard—till the accession of Evil-Merodach in the year 561 B.C. Jeremiah uttered a brief lament over the fate of the young king. Ezekiel also, who was one of the train which accompanied him to Babylonia, describes the young lion that was taken in a pit and brought in a cage to Babylon.²

¹ 2 Kings, 24². On the length of time Nebuchadrezzar had his headquarters at Riblah, see Winckler in *Keilinschr. und Altes Test.* ³p. 108.

² Jer. 22³⁴⁻³⁰, cf. 13¹⁸⁻²¹, Ezek. 19³⁻⁹. It has been suggested that Jehoiachin and his court were mildly treated in order to intimate that he might be

Although the city did not suffer the extremity of siege at this time, Nebuchadrezzar was not minded to let it go unpunished. That he carried away the palace treasures and a part of the vessels of the Temple is what we might expect.¹ More important for history was the forced emigration of the principal inhabitants. Besides the members of the court, the Babylonian carried away the leading men of the city, officials, men-at-arms, and master-artisans. His idea was to break the power of the nation, so that it would not again rebel. We may suppose that Egyptian sympathisers were especially marked for this punishment, which the king thought would be exemplary. Or, he may have had in mind Assyrian precedent, as we saw it in the case of Samaria, only he hesitated to go the Assyrian length. It was natural to suppose that the leading men of the nation being once out of the way, there would be no more suggestion of revolt. The sequel shows how the wisest statesmen may miscalculate.

The impression made upon faithful Judaïtes by these disorders, incursions, and triumph of the Chaldeans, is reflected in the little book which bears the name of Habakkuk. The author is known to us only by this sigh and meditation over the problems of his time. He seems to be one of those who felt that Judah had shown herself righteous before Yahweh by carrying out the commands in the Book of Instruction. But this righteousness had not obtained the approval of God, or the prosperity which had been promised. Instead of peace there had come renewed and more cruel warfare. The Chaldeans—a hasty and violent nation—are going through the earth to seize what is not theirs. If Yahweh is indeed of purer eyes than to behold iniquity, how does this comport with His government of the world? As things are, we see confusion and trouble, instead of the peace for which we had hoped. Nor can we find comfort in the thought that this is for the glory of Yahweh. The victor rejoices in his own strength, and, if he worships at all, he worships his own weapons as divine. With such thoughts, the prophet finds refuge in prayer, and then receives the message on which—although it does not solve the

restored in case Zedekiah's conduct was not satisfactory; so Erbt, *Jeremia und seine zeit* (1902) p. 23.

¹ All the golden vessels which Solomon had made are specified by the Hebrew author—2 Kings, 24¹³. It should be remembered, however, that the Temple had been repeatedly plundered since the time of Solomon.

world-problem—he is able to stay his soul: “The righteous shall live in his fidelity.”¹ The relation of God to the individual believer is becoming a matter of experience.

The first deportation took place in the year 597 B. C. It is an event of the greatest importance for the future of the chosen people. Eight thousand heads of families is the computation of a Hebrew writer.² This would imply a train of forty thousand people. These were settled in Babylonia in a community of their own. Their hope for an early return held them together till the fall of Jerusalem. By this time they had begun to fit themselves to the situation, and to maintain something of their separate life as against the heathenism about them. They were reinforced by a few of their compatriots later, and were thus enabled to begin that life of sojourn which has been the life of Judaism down to the present day.

The untimely death of Josiah, the success of Egypt and then the Chaldean invasion, as well as the personal character of Jehoiakim, must have undone a large part of the work of reform. This conclusion may be drawn from the nature of the case, and it is confirmed by the discourses of Jeremiah. We have already had occasion to quote from this remarkable man, but we may now note more in detail the experience which he went through. The title of weeping prophet, given him as the supposed author of the book of Lamentations, makes a false impression. He did indeed weep, as every oriental weeps, in time of calamity, but it would be wrong to picture him whining or sobbing, or bathed in tears. His general attitude is that of the stern judge, compelled by truth and by fidelity to conscience to denounce the sinfulness of the people whom he yet loved. His courage in thus standing alone against the men of his time, justifies his own comparison of himself to a brazen wall and an iron tower. He seems to have been of a gentle and affectionate nature. His love of his country is undoubted—the best evidence is that he loathed her shame. He knew that if he delivered his message he would be contradicted, scoffed at, abused as a traitor. The prompting of his heart was to keep silent. But the word was too strong for him—he could not forbear. So he went on speaking the message as it was given him, knowing all the time that he was alienating his

¹ Hab. 2⁴. The last chapter of the book seems to belong in a later time.

² 2 Kings, 24¹⁶. The ten thousand of v. 14 seems to be a round number.

friends, angering the mob, offending the rulers. Privately he expostulated with his God, pleaded with Him, wept before Him, relieved his feelings by pouring out maledictions upon his persecutors. And his only consolation was a renewed call to duty with the assurance that the worst was yet to come.

What we find surprising in Jeremiah's long career is the uniformity of his message. For Josiah he had respect and even affection. But the state of Judah was not satisfactory to him even in the exaltation of the great reform. It must have been about the time of the reform that he delivered a discourse which might be taken as summing up his message. Speaking to Judah in the name of Yahweh, he says :

"I remember the love of thy youth, the affection of thy honeymoon, thy following me into the desert. . . . What fault did your fathers find in me that they deserted me and followed after nothingness, and themselves became vain? . . . I brought you into the garden-land to eat its fruit and its produce, but you defiled my land and made my heritage an abomination. The priests do not say : Where is Yahweh? Those whose business is instruction, do not know me. The shepherds of the people have rebelled against me. The prophets prophesy by Baal and walk after what does not help. . . . Go to the shores of Cyprus and look, and send to Kedar and inquire carefully whether the like of this has taken place—has any nation exchanged its god for another? But my people has exchanged its Glory for that which does not help." ¹

It is easy to see that Jeremiah has adopted the parable of Hosea. Judah is Yahweh's wife. She was faithful in the first flush of youthful affection, but now she has deserted Him, running after the Baals. The conclusion of the discourse points out that a woman who is married to another may not return to her first husband. Hence the prophet argues that Judah is for ever *taboo* to her covenant Lord, and repentance is vain. The repentance he has in mind is probably the ebullition of feeling in the reform movement. In a discourse which borrows the language of Deuteronomy he emphasised the covenant made with the fathers when they came out of Egypt, but only to point out that the covenant had been broken and that the outlook was hopeless: "Can prayers or sacrificial flesh take away thine evil, or canst thou thus

¹ Jer. 2 ¹⁻¹¹, cf. 3 ¹⁻⁵, which seems to be the conclusion of the same discourse.

be delivered?"¹ The rhetorical question is an emphatic negative. The prophet would have it otherwise. He tries to intercede for his people as though to ask that their repentance may be accepted. But he is forbidden to pray for them, and told that though the most effectual intercessors of past times (Moses and Samuel) were to appear on behalf of the people, all would be in vain. The ear of Yahweh is closed.

The prophet's mind seems to have dwelt much on the burden of guilt inherited from the past. The sins of Manasseh and his time—how could present well-doing atone for these? On account of these alone Yahweh must punish, and to them was added the habitual craving of the people for the old gods. Even in their reform measures they were making the old mistake of supposing that Yahweh was concerned chiefly about ritual. Scornfully He inquires concerning the new enrichments of the service: "Why does incense from Sheba come before me and sweet cane from a far country? Your burnt offerings are not accepted, nor are your sacrifices well pleasing to me." So far as Yahweh cares, they may put their burnt offerings and their sacrifices together and eat them themselves; and He roundly declares: "I spoke not with your fathers, nor did I command them in respect to burnt offerings and sacrifices the day I brought them out of the land of Egypt; but this thing I commanded them: Hearken to my voice and I will be your God and you shall be my people."² To hearken to the voice of Yahweh is *to do right*. Jeremiah is quite clear as to what is meant. Objurgating the false confidence in the Temple, as was noted above, he adds: "If you practise justice between man and man, if you do not oppress the client, the fatherless, the widow, if you do not shed innocent blood in this place, or go after other gods to do evil—then I will make you dwell in this place."³ Properly speaking, ritual has no place at all in this list of requirements.

The recrudescence of the old abuses under Jehoiakim, to-

¹ Jer. 11¹⁵—emended text.

² *Ibid.*, 7²² f. The passage shows, with a clearness which none can mistake, that Jeremiah knew nothing of any divinely given Levitical legislation. On sacrifices cf. 6³⁰, 7³¹. The allusion to incense quoted above indicates that it is something new in the Temple service. Probably Babylonian influence may be traced here.

³ *Ibid.*, 7⁵⁻⁷. The verses immediately follow the one which describes the false confidence.

gether with the personal character of that monarch, only made the prospect darker. It was in the fourth year of this king that Jeremiah was pressed in spirit to give a solemn testimony. He was prevented from going to the Temple for some ritual reason. But it was a fast day, when the people would come to worship in large numbers. He therefore had his friend Baruch write down at his dictation an epitome of his discourses and read it before the multitude. His object was, no doubt, to show the consistency of his message. For twenty years this was what he had declared to the people. So far forth he was defending his own call—for consistency is one mark of fidelity. But the incident only accentuated the opposition of the prophet to the leaders. While the book was a-reading, one of the king's officers brought intelligence of it to the royal council then in session. Perhaps they were even then deliberating on the alliance against Nebuchadrezzar. They sent a messenger and brought Baruch before them and had him read the book. Assuring themselves that it was the genuine dictation of Jeremiah, they advised Baruch to seek a place of concealment. At the same time they took possession of the book and brought it to the king. One of them began to read it aloud, but no more than three or four pages were read before the king became angry, cut the roll to pieces and threw it into the brazier burning before him.¹ He also ordered the arrest of Jeremiah and Baruch, but they could not be found. At the command of Yahweh, however, the contents of the roll were recorded on another roll with additions from the recollection of the prophet.

The roll thus rewritten probably became the nucleus of our present book of Jeremiah. The earlier chapters of the book bear the marks of such composition. In them we seem to hear the author's *apologia pro vita sua*. He tells us how he heard the voice of Yahweh commanding him to preach; how at this time he foresaw calamity coming upon his people; how he would have refused on account of his youth; how he has been faithful in delivering the message. At times he records for us the struggle which went on between his natural inclination and the overpowering Word of Yahweh.² All this was calculated to impress

¹ Jer. 36. The material must have been papyrus, otherwise an intolerable smoke would have resulted.

² Jer. 1⁶, 6¹¹, 11^{19 ff.}, 18^{18 ff.}

the reader, or hearer, with the genuineness of the call, and with the fidelity of the one who received it.

In spite of the nature of the message there was still a possibility that the final doom might not be put into execution. "Perchance the house of Judah will listen to all the evil I am planning to do them, so as to turn from their evil way—then I will forgive their iniquity and their sin." Yahweh is not so bound by His purposes that He cannot change. The potter who finds the vessel he is making not shaped to his mind, can crush the clay together and mould it into a different form. So Yahweh has power and freedom. While there is life there is hope—but the hope which hangs on to the last breath of the dying man is a very slender hope indeed.¹ Certainly if the sinfulness continues, the punishment is sure.

The king who burned the book without even hearing it was not likely to be deterred from any step on which he had set his heart. And we may suppose that the incident was a turning-point in Jeremiah's own feeling. He became convinced that the evil would certainly come. From this time on he had the calmness of a man who knows the worst. The testimony was kept up, that the people might be without excuse. And we must remember that a different school of prophets was singing in another key. There were plenty of these to assure the people that they should not see sword or famine. Their activity was a challenge to Jeremiah. His silence might be construed as giving assent to their false hopes. The sharpness of the issue was not moderated even to the end, when Jeremiah had the poor satisfaction of seeing his prediction verified in the destruction of his country.

We have already seen that the Deuteronomistic school continued their literary work after the finding of the now famous book in the Temple. We have no reason to suppose that they were inactive during the reign of Jehoiakim. The more discouraging external circumstances seemed to be, the more tenaciously they would hold on to their own point of view. They therefore supplemented the book which was now their favorite study, by inserting further commandments and by expanding the hortatory sections. As Yahweh seemed about to desert His people, the record of earlier blessings became more precious. To an author

¹ Chapter 18 (the potter) is designed to indicate Yahweh's right to change His plan according to circumstances.

of this school we may attribute the poem now included in the book of Deuteronomy and called the Song of Moses.¹ The composition puts into rhythmical form the prophetic rebuke of Israel. Yahweh, the Most High, chose Israel as His possession; He led the people in the wilderness, and brought them into the land of milk and honey. But Israel grew prosperous and rebellious—rejected its God for others, and so aroused His jealousy. Hence His threat of visitation. But the punishment will show them that the false gods cannot save. So, when they cry to Him, He will hear and save, and destroy their enemies. With such hopes of a speedy sentence upon the oppressive Chaldeans, faithful men nourished their hearts in this time of trouble.

Jeremiah carried on his campaign of protest in the last year of Jehoiakim by an object lesson. When the Chaldean army invaded the land, the country people took refuge behind the walls of Jerusalem. Among them came the clan of Rechabites, which we have already had occasion to mention in connection with Jehu.² Jeremiah took note of their presence, and one day brought them to the Temple, and set wine before them. They refused to drink, and gave as a reason the vow of their ancestor, Jonadab ben Rechab. This vow bound them to Israel's ancient mode of life in the desert—they were not to drink wine, or to build houses, or to plant fields or vineyards. This they had faithfully observed, and no pressure was strong enough to make them disobey. This fidelity of theirs was in strong contrast to the conduct of Judah. They were faithful to a mere human injunction; Judah had refused to keep a solemn covenant with Yahweh.

It was not without abundant monition, therefore, that the people of Jerusalem saw their fate approaching. In one respect, indeed, the prophet's expectation was not fulfilled by the event. Jehoiakim died in his bed and was buried in the sepulchre of the kings—whereas Jeremiah had declared that his unburied carcass should be fought over by the dogs. But this is a mere matter of detail. For the young Jehoiachin and the queen-mother, Jeremiah had a dirge lamenting the loss of the flock, scarcely committed to them before they were carried into captivity.³

¹ Deut. 32. The text is corrected in places by the commentaries.

² Above, p. 191. The account of the incident is contained in Jer. 35.

³ Jer. 13¹⁸⁻²⁰. The parable of the spoiled girdle in the early part of the same chapter may belong in the same period.

Nebuchadrezzar appointed Jehoiachin's uncle—Mattaniah—the third son of Josiah, to come to the throne—changing his name to Zedekiah, *the Justice of Yahweh*. Whether this expresses Nebuchadrezzar's claim to be the executor of that justice upon the unfortunate Jehoiachin cannot now be made out. The people might have so interpreted it with profit to themselves. Nebuchadrezzar expected his "blood-letting" to have a sobering and regenerating effect on the body politic. The result was the exact opposite of the expectation.

Nor is this hard to account for. The people had for a long time been threatened with a judgment from Yahweh. Those who remained behind in Jerusalem felt that the judgment had now fallen, and it had not been as bad as they had expected. Whether Isaiah's doctrine of the Remnant had been widely adopted or not, it was now virtually applied. The prophetic preaching always assumed that those who should repent would be spared—is not the justice of God pledged not to destroy the righteous with the wicked? Nothing was easier than to argue that if those who repent are to be spared, then those who are actually spared are the ones who have repented. The dregs of the people, left behind in Jerusalem, laid this flattering unction to their souls: "We have been spared by Yahweh, therefore we are righteous in His sight." Then there was the excitement of the new situation. The leading men had been carried away, but the framework of the government remained. A new king was on the throne, and his court must not lack in titles and dignities. We can imagine the scramble for offices with high-sounding titles. The self-sufficiency of *parvenus* and their self-confidence is proverbial. The new king was a good-natured but nerveless man. His courtiers were ignorant, arrogant, intolerant, overbearing in their conduct toward their monarch.

The people at large were intoxicated with joy at their escape, and at their new importance. The exiles had been obliged to dispose of their property on such terms as they could make. The purchasers or usurpers felt that they had great bargains. They were now the gentry and landed proprietors of the nation. That they showed the pride that goes before destruction is evident. Jeremiah does not hesitate to give his opinion. After the deportation he saw two baskets of figs—the one very good, the other very bad. The voice of Yahweh told him that the

good represented the exiles; the bad were those who were left behind. Ezekiel also alludes to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, who say of the exiles: "They are far from the land of Yahweh; *to us* is the land given for a possession."¹ Upon men in this frame of mind exhortation has no effect.

The new rulers were not long in trying their hands at the game of politics. Egypt was still ready to promise great things. The neighbours of Judah were tired of their divisions, and they began to realise that they were oppressed by the Babylonians. Plans were soon agitated for a common effort at independence. Ambassadors from Edom, Moab, Ammon, Tyre, and Sidon came to Jerusalem to concert measures. Jeremiah appeared in a way which we should call sensational. He made a number of wooden yokes. One of them he wore himself; the others he carried for the foreign ambassadors. His advice was given in words as well as by symbols, to the effect that they should "put their necks into the yoke of the king of Babylon."² But the large majority of the prophets was on the other side. They confidently declared that within two years the vessels of the Temple which Nebuchadnezzar had carried away should be brought back, and one Hananiah in an ecstasy snatched the yoke from Jeremiah's neck and broke it, with the exclamation: "Thus saith Yahweh: So will I break the yoke of the king of Babylon from the neck of all the nations."

Jeremiah contented himself at this time with expressing a hope that the word might be true—though he pointed out plainly that the analogies of prophetic revelation were all against it. It was only after some time that the word of Yahweh was borne in upon him so that he could make a positive declaration. This he did in the words: "Thus saith Yahweh: Thou hast broken the yoke of wood, but I will make a yoke of iron. I will put a yoke of iron on the necks of all these peoples that they may serve the king of Babylon." The too sanguine Hananiah received also a personal message to the effect that he should die the same year, which was fulfilled.

If we are to find room in the life of Zedekiah for the visit to

¹ Ezek. 11¹⁵: on the text, Toy's edition in Haupt's series, or Giesebrecht in the *Handkommentar*. Cf. Jer. 24.

² Jer. 27 and 28. The account is not from Jeremiah himself, but seems to rest on good information.

Babylon of which mention is made toward the close of the book of Jeremiah¹ it must be about this time. It is altogether likely that Nebuchadrezzar would get news of the projected alliance and would call Zedekiah to account. The statement in our book, however, is in a very late passage and we cannot be certain that it is based on trustworthy tradition. That Nebuchadrezzar's headquarters were at Riblah for a considerable period we have already noted.

The exiles in Babylonia entertained similar illusions to those held at Jerusalem, and the idea of an early return was impressed upon them by their prophets. There seems nothing improbable therefore in the account of Jeremiah's letter to them, called out by messages from Babylon hostile to the prophet. The letter warns the exiles against false hopes of return; seventy years must elapse before the visitation for which they sighed. The period of seventy years—which would allow at least two generations to grow up—is not intended to keep alive the hopes of the people, but to emphasise the fact that the return is a long way off. It is necessary therefore that the people adapt themselves to their circumstances, make homes for themselves, raise up children, and seek the welfare of the great kingdom into which they have now been incorporated.² We know also from Ezekiel that the exiles were unwilling to believe in the coming calamity for Jerusalem and we naturally suppose that they were looking for an early return.

In cherishing vain hopes, in framing vain plots, the years passed till 589 B. C., when Nebuchadrezzar was obliged to send an army to Palestine. At its first appearance before Jerusalem a spasm of repentance passed over the people. Understanding from the prophet that justice and kindness would obtain the favour of Yahweh, they looked about for some of the duties left undone which they might still perform. In the Book of Instruction they found the ordinance, contained also in the older Book of the Covenant,³ that the slave of Hebrew birth should be set free after six years' service. The law seems always to have been a counsel of perfec-

¹ Jer. 51⁵⁹. On Zedekiah's obligation to Nebuchadrezzar we have Ezekiel's explicit statement (Ezek. 17¹³); compare also the same prophet's parable of the eagle and the cedar branch (17¹⁻¹⁰).

² Jer. 29. The chapter in its present form is apparently of comparatively late date.

³ Deut. 15¹²⁻¹⁸; Ex. 21¹⁻⁶. The differences do not here concern us.

tion. All the more would it be a proof of their new zeal for obedience to Yahweh. King and people therefore entered into a solemn engagement. According to an ancient ceremonial, a calf was sacrificed and cut in halves. By walking between the pieces the engagers imprecated the divine vengeance upon themselves in case they should violate their oath.¹

For the moment it seemed as if the strenuous effort would be rewarded. Pharaoh Hophra (Apries) marched with his army into Palestine with the apparent intention of defending his allies. The Chaldean army therefore temporarily withdrew from Jerusalem to meet the threatened attack. The Jerusalemites concluded that the expected deliverance had taken place, and with indecent haste violated their oath and forced the just liberated slaves back into servitude. It is needless to comment on the levity and lack of feeling of responsibility shown by this transaction. No wonder that Jeremiah despaired of such a people.

The Pharaoh was again a vain help. Whether he was defeated in a pitched battle, as is asserted by Josephus,² or whether he retreated without fighting, as is implied in the account in Jeremiah, cannot certainly be made out. The effect upon the fortune of Jerusalem was the same, for in a short time the Chaldean army returned and a formal siege of the city was begun. This lasted for a year and a half, during which the city was closely invested, and the battering-rams were kept at work. The besieged defended themselves with courage and skill. Otherwise we cannot account for the length of time they held out—weakened as they were by the recent deportation of the flower of their army. They suffered from famine and pestilence, and probably from internal dissension as well. The traditions preserved for us in the book of Jeremiah probably give a correct picture of the time, and we may, therefore, follow the fortunes of the prophet as there recounted.

When the siege was temporarily raised by the Chaldeans Jeremiah attempted to go to his own village of Anathoth. He may have thought he could protect his little property by being on the spot; as a non-combatant he would be spared by the invaders;

¹ Jer. 34⁸⁻²². Note especially v. 19 and compare Gen. 15⁹⁻¹⁸, where Yahweh and Abraham enter into covenant by a similar rite. For Babylonian analogies cf. *Keilinschriften und Altes Testament*³, p. 597.

² Josephus, *Ant.* X, VII, 3; Jer. 37¹.

possibly he reasoned that if he were out of the city there would be one mouth less to feed. But any move he might make would be looked upon with suspicion. He had aroused the violent hatred of the national party by opposing their plans for revolt. For a long time he had been regarded as a traitor. It was natural that the guard should apprehend him at the city gate and accuse him of desertion to the enemy.

Those who had charge of him were prepared to make treason odious, and they thrust him into the most noisome place at their command. This was an old cistern, the floor of which was deep with slime. The account of his experiences here may be read at length in the Biblical text. After being released from the immediate danger of suffocation—this was on the intercession of a slave of the king—he was kept in the king's prison till the end of the siege. The king would have set him at liberty, but could do nothing against the will of the nobles. He even sent for the prophet secretly and asked his advice. Jeremiah consistently urged him to surrender before the final storm and sack of the city. But this Zedekiah could not get himself to do.

From the king's fear that the Judaites in the camp of Nebuchadrezzar might abuse him, we gather that a considerable number had already made their peace with the Babylonians. Zedekiah was but a shadow king over a desperate band of men. His interviews with Jeremiah always had the same termination. He even asked Jeremiah to prevaricate concerning the subject of their conversations. At last the end came. The bread in the city was exhausted about the same time that a breach was made in the city wall. Zedekiah, at the head of the few soldiers still alive, tried to cut his way through the enemy, hoping to escape down the Jericho road. In the wilderness a band of desperate men might be able to maintain themselves even against the Babylonians.

The Chaldeans were too expert to allow anything of this kind to succeed. The sortie was fortunate in that the king eluded the immediate besiegers. But the party was pursued and in the Jordan valley they were overtaken and captured. Nebuchadrezzar seems to have remained in his headquarters at Riblah. Hither the Judaite king with his forlorn train were brought. It is scarcely a matter for surprise that Nebuchadrezzar dealt severely with them. Zedekiah's sons were put to death before his eyes,

and he himself was blinded and taken to Babylon, where he ended his days in prison. A large number of his officers were executed.

The poor king had paid the penalty of his weakness. The city over which he was nominal ruler was more to blame. It had shown itself constantly inconstant. Seditious, obstinate, and lacking in good faith, it had provoked the utmost severity of the conqueror. It was given over to sack. The Temple was plundered of all that was valuable and was then set on fire. The houses of the people also were looted and burned. It seems to have been the king's purpose to make the place uninhabitable. A miserable remnant of people had survived the siege. Such as did not perish in the sack or by the hand of the executioner were carried away to Babylonia. Three detachments are mentioned in the book of Jeremiah, amounting to four thousand six hundred heads of families.¹ Of these only a little over eight hundred were taken at the fall of the city. Of the poorer classes there were left enough to prevent the country's reversion to jungle. The district was made part of the Babylonian province and a governor was appointed with his seat at Mizpah—an ancient sanctuary not far from Jerusalem.

The governor appointed was one Gedaliah, a Judaite of the Babylonian party. Jeremiah was given his choice of going to Babylon or of remaining in his ruined country. He chose to remain. In the circumstances we can see that barbarism was the first danger. Gedaliah caused it to be known that there was to be a settled government, and attempted to organise his administration. Fugitives began to return, and some of the guerilla bands which had been living on the country came in and submitted. The captain of one such band—Ishmael by name—could not brook even the semblance of power in the hands of a renegade—for such he must have held Gedaliah to be. Ishmael himself was of royal blood, and perhaps thought to repeat the career of his ancestor David. He was supported (secretly we may suppose), by Baalis, King of Ammon, and perhaps, also had Egyptian encouragement. Gedaliah, though warned against him,

¹ Jer. 52 ²⁸⁻³¹. The paragraph is lacking in the text of 2 Kings, which otherwise runs parallel to this chapter. I have adopted the conjecture of Ewald (see Giesebrecht's commentary) which makes v. ²⁸ refer to the *seventeenth* year of Nebuchadrezzar instead of the *seven* of the text.

was unsuspecting and so was assassinated. Ishmael then terrorised the people. Discovering that he could not permanently hold the country against the Babylonians, he started to cross over to Ammon, carrying with him some unwilling followers—among them are mentioned some ladies of the royal family.

Whatever his hopes of establishing a new Judah beyond the Jordan, they were soon frustrated. He was met by a stronger, or more valiant, band under one Johanan ben Kareah, who was able to rescue his captives out of his hand. It was, perhaps, after these disorders that the Babylonians carried away the third of the detachments of exiles mentioned above.¹

The disconsolate Judaïtes, thus finding themselves at liberty, looked around for some place where they might live in peace. Egypt was the only country that seemed to hold out hopes, and they resolved to go thither. Jeremiah advised against it, but they not only refused to listen—they compelled him to go with them. They were weary of their unsettled life, weary of advice, weary of Yahweh. They refused to listen any longer to preaching. When the prophet rebuked them for continued idolatry of the "Queen of Heaven," they turned sharply upon him and declared that when they were faithful to her service it went well with them, but that when they gave her up and devoted themselves to Yahweh alone all went wrong. The prophet was conscious in his own soul of the falsity of their reasoning, but he seems to have found no answer that he could make to them. Tradition, however, ascribes to him a prediction that even in Egypt they would be the victims of the relentless Chaldean power.² With this final denunciation of disaster we lose sight of the aged prophet. The tradition that he was murdered by his unbelieving countrymen is a late inference from the story of his life. The Judaïtes who went to Egypt at this time were absorbed in the native population and lost all hold upon the prophetic religion.

¹ Doubt has been expressed as to the historicity of this whole account as well as of what follows—see for example Prof. Nathaniel Schmidt's article "Jeremiah" in the *Encyclop. Biblica*. But the narrative seems to me in its main features to bear the marks of historic truth.

² Jer. 44. The chapter seems to be added by a later hand. It is not yet clearly made out whether Nebuchadrezzar actually conquered Egypt; cf. McCurdy, *History, Prophecy, and the Monuments*, III, p. 389 f.

Had the exiles in Babylonia kept no firmer hold on Yahweh, the history of Israel would have closed with the fall of Jerusalem in 586 B.C. We have traced the growth of a nation from the scattered tribes which entered Canaan seven hundred years before this. We have seen the nation under Solomon attain a respectable position among the kingdoms of Asia. We have noted also the disruption and the consequent loss of power. The two little kingdoms could not hope to maintain their independence against the powerful empires of the Euphrates valley. Their misguided attempts to resist led to their ruin. Nothing in their career would give their history greater importance than the history of Philistia or of Damascus, had it not been for the religion of Yahweh and the exile.

The feeble remnant of Judah, however, were in a position to carry on the work of the prophets. It was not without reason that up to this time the prophets had complained that the people's ears were deaf to their message. In the bonds of tradition, in the midst of wars and alarms, pressed upon by the claims of Egypt, the claims of Assyria or Babylonia, the claims of the party of independence, we can hardly wonder that they could not rightly estimate the message of their preachers. But when the bonds of tradition were loosened by removal from their land, when they were protected from wars and alarms by their very insignificance, when politics were no longer a concern to them—above all, when the long-threatened blow had fallen, then they had time for reflection. The prophets had said Yahweh would give over to destruction the place which He had chosen "to make His name dwell there." The people would not believe that He would thus deprive Himself of His chosen dwelling. But now He had done so. The fearful catastrophe gave them two alternatives. Either they must give up their faith in Him and hold him to be a God too weak to protect his own, or else they must believe in what His prophets had said. No doubt many—like the fugitives to Egypt just spoken of—chose the former alternative. These became worshippers of other gods, loosened the ties of kindred, and became absorbed in the surrounding heathenism. But some there were who chose the other alternative, held on to their faith in Yahweh, and began to value more justly the words of the prophets. It is this fraction of the people—a sect, a church, no longer a nation—which has in-

fluenced the history of the world. And it is with these that we must now concern ourselves.

As to the poor of the people who were left in the district of Judah, there is not much to say. For them barbarism was the first danger.¹ They had all they could do to wring a living out of the reluctant soil. The Bedawin from the east and from the south overran the country. Edom was crowded upon by the Nabateans, and pushed up into Judah. A half-century later almost the whole of Judah's territory belonged to these invaders, and the bitter hatred of the Edomites, which finds expression in later times, dates from this period of encroachment. The people of the land seem, indeed, to have kept alive the religion of their ancestors. We read how men came with offerings to the site of the Temple, after the sacred building had been destroyed.² They came in the garb of mourners, so that we cannot suppose them ignorant of the calamity which had fallen. Evidently the sacredness of the site could not be erased by the destruction of the edifice. At the place which Yahweh had once chosen, men might still hope to approach Him. This was the feeling of these poor people. And we may suppose that during the years that followed the sacredness of the site was in some way kept in mind—perhaps marked by the crude offerings which a peasant or pastoral people brings to its God.

But our main interest is now with the little community in Babylonia, which had followed with the keenest sympathy the fortunes of their native country, and whose grief at its conquest was not the less poignant that they were so far away.

¹ Cf. Ezek. 11¹⁵, 33²⁴.

² Jer. 41⁵. These men are said to be from Shiloh and Samaria.

CHAPTER XV

THE EXILE

It has already been told how some years before the fall of Jerusalem, a considerable body of Jerusalemites were carried away by Nebuchadrezzar, and settled in Babylonia. It would seem that they were not made slaves, and that they were not taken to the city of Babylon, whose proletariat we may suppose to have been already numerous enough. The indications are that they were settled in agricultural communities along one of the great irrigating canals, to which the country then owed its extraordinary productiveness. The "river" Chebar, of our text, was such a canal.¹ Babylonian supervision seems not to have gone so far as to destroy a certain measure of autonomy. We hear of the Sheikhs (Elders), who came to the prophet for advice, and we naturally suppose that they preserved something of their traditional authority.

The expectations of these people have already been remarked upon. In the face of all human probability their prophets fostered a hope that they would soon return to their native land. Jeremiah bitterly opposed these delusions, and saw plainly that the exile would be of long duration. But even he could hardly suppose that Yahweh would permanently leave His people in the hands of foreigners. For the time being this hope may have made the exiles cling together, so that they were able to adapt themselves to their new circumstances. But it also made them restless and unwilling to listen to the counsel of the more thoughtful of their number. It was not till the fall of Jerusalem that they were disposed to look the situation squarely in the face. That they did so then, and that they were able to adhere to the faith of Yahweh, is due to Ezekiel, in some respects the most remarkable of Israel's prophets.

¹ Ezek. 1¹, and elsewhere. References in Kraetzschmar, *Handkommentar* (1900), and in Toy's edition of the text (*Sacred Books of the Old Testament*, 1899).

Ezekiel, like Jeremiah, came of a priestly family. The two men, however, were very unlike. Jeremiah was anything but a ritualist. The terms in which he speaks of the Ark, of the Temple, of the sacrificial service, show that his interest was not in any of these. Whether he ever officiated in the sanctuary where he so often spoke to the people is doubtful. Ezekiel also may never have officiated in the Temple. If so, it was because he was carried away when too young to be admitted to a part in the service. But he was thoroughly saturated with priestly ideas. Ritual offences have a much larger part in his indictment of the people than is the case with the other prophets. The form of his vision is determined by the imagery he has seen in the Temple. His elaborate picture of the restored Israel shows us a commonwealth which lives by ritual. In him the ethical ideas of the older prophets (and of the Book of Instruction) are for the first time united with the traditions of the priestly caste. From a modern point of view this seems a retrogression. But men at a certain stage of culture crave ritual, and (humanly speaking) it was necessary that the great moral ideas of the prophets should be thus married to outward forms if they were to be brought into the life of the people. The result was to shape the whole later course of Jewish thought and history.

Great wit's to madness near allied—this is the thought which comes to us as we read of the strange visions and the fantastic actions of this prophet. In fact, Ezekiel, like some other great religious geniuses, was a man nervously abnormal. The greatness of the crisis through which he had passed so wrought upon him that his thought has in it something morbid. And yet the ideas which rule him are sane and sound. In fact they are for the most part borrowed from the older prophets. His originality is in elaborating, sometimes to grotesqueness, what his predecessors have said. It will repay us to notice this somewhat in detail.

Like his predecessors, Ezekiel founded his claim to be heard on a distinct call of Yahweh. This call came to him in vision. The minuteness with which he describes the vision is what draws our attention. It was enough for Isaiah to say that he saw Yahweh in the Temple seated on a lofty throne clothed in robes whose skirts filled the House, attended by the seraphim. Ezekiel gives us a description of the cherubim, of the celestial chariot, of the throne and the canopy. From him we learn that the

cherubim which bear the throne are composite creatures with four faces. They have feet of quadrupeds, wings of birds, hands of men. They are a part of the chariot of Yahweh. This chariot is provided with wonderful wheels full of eyes. In the midst of the wheels is a mass of flame. Above this is a support resting on the heads of the cherubim, and on this support is a throne, the occupant of which in the likeness of a man was Yahweh Himself. The brightness of burnished brass, the clearness of crystal, and the colours of the rainbow, dazzled the beholder and he fell powerless to the ground.

New as is the vision thus presented to us, its elements are furnished by tradition. Of old, Yahweh was the God of the storm. On swift clouds He was accustomed to come to the help of His people. Of old also the cherubim were His attendants—was it not for this reason they were represented in the Temple? The wheels, the throne, the fire, the rainbow were all there from a logical necessity.

We should be wrong to suppose that we have here only a literary fiction, the result of the prophet's reflection on these features of the traditional theophany. No doubt it was a genuine experience which he describes—whether in the body or out of the body he would not be able to tell. And it would not be hard for him to discover a gracious purpose in it. He was in a strange land, far from the sanctuary which his heart yearned for. He was tempted to feel—as his compatriots already felt—that Yahweh was far away. But by the vision he was taught that Yahweh could come to His servant though in a far land.

This mobility of Yahweh was the more important in that some of the Judaites still cherished the fixed idea that He could not permit the destruction of His Temple. Though Jerusalem had once been forced to surrender, and though these very people had been forced to go into exile, still they persisted that the city was indestructible. Ezekiel, for his part, was sure that the city was to be destroyed. What would become of Yahweh was a question answered by the celestial chariot. With this at His command He could retire at His will to the desert of His ancient sojourn, to abide there till His time to restore His people should come. The prophetic theory that the sins of the people had made His land intolerable to Him was thus most emphatically presented and enforced. The shock of the final catastrophe was thus in a

measure, also, prepared for, and the foundation laid for a new hope.¹

First of all, however, the false confidence of the exiles must be shaken; and Ezekiel perceives that his message is a message of mourning, lamentation, and woe. This message is delivered him by Yahweh in the form of a book, and in materialistic symbolism he receives it by eating it.² He is told that he is sent to a rebellious house. But he is to speak to them whether they will hear or whether they will forbear. In fact, they at first met the prophet with contradiction and scoffing. But the message came to its rights after the fall of Jerusalem.

For this first period of his activity the prophet spared no pains to enforce the declaration that *Jerusalem is to be destroyed*. His endeavours to make this plain were nothing less than grotesque. At one time he took a clay tablet such as the Babylonians used for writing upon. On this he drew the plan of Jerusalem. Then he made it the centre of a miniature siege—threw up earthworks about it, made the semblance of a hostile camp, set up the battering-rams. Between himself and it he held a sheet of iron. The performance scarcely needed an interpreter. As he, the creator of the toy city, was ordering its siege and holding the sheet of iron between himself and it, so Yahweh the ruler of Jerusalem was arranging the attack on His own city and was making Himself impervious to its appeals for mercy. We may imagine the effect of such a symbolical action on the part of the prophet.³

By making a vile bread of grain, beans, spelt, and lentils, mixed together, by eating of this a fixed ration each day, and by drinking also a slender allowance of water, the prophet illustrated the straits to which Jerusalem would be reduced in the siege.⁴ After this was sufficiently set forth he shaved his hair and his

¹ In my discussion I assume the substantial unity and genuineness of the Book of Ezekiel. Traces of editorial elaboration are somewhat more numerous than has been usually admitted, and I have some reserve in regard to the middle section of the book—Chapters 25–32.

² Ezek. 3¹⁻³. Similar language is used in Jer. 15¹⁶.

³ I assume, of course, that this (ch. 4¹⁻⁷) and the other actions were literally carried out as described. Some readers will doubt the literalness of the prophet's lying on his side 190 days (as should be read instead of 390 of the text). But a prolonged illness might easily realise this feature of the vision.

⁴ His protest (4¹⁴) against part of the direction shows his carefulness in matters of ritual observance.

beard with a sharp sword. A third part of the hair thus obtained he burned in the midst of his miniature city ; a third he smote hither and yonder with the sword ; the most of the remainder he scattered to the winds. A few hairs he took and bound in his skirt. But of these again a portion was thrown into the fire. Again the symbolism is quite clear : A third of Yahweh's people are to perish by famine and pestilence in the siege ; another third will fall by the sword ; the remainder will be scattered to all the winds of heaven ; even the few who seem to be spared—the exiles¹—will not really be safe from destruction. All this will happen “that they may know that I am Yahweh”—that is, that they may know Him in His essential nature as a God of justice.

If now a bill of particulars is called for, to show wherein Judah has deserved so much severity, Ezekiel is ready with an answer. In vision he is taken to Jerusalem and made witness of what is going on there. Taken by the Spirit to the Temple he is allowed to inspect what ought to be the sanctuary of Yahweh. Yahweh Himself points out how it is polluted. Near the north gate he sees *the idol that provokes jealousy*—evidently an image of another than Israel's God. The abuses corrected by Josiah had evidently been revived by his successors, but what god had received the honour of a place in the Temple is unknown to us. Next, the prophet is taken into a secret chamber within the Temple, on whose walls are portrayed in relief all sorts of animals and reptiles. Before them stand seventy of the chief men of Judah, at their head one Jaazaniah. Each man has a censer in his hand and they are offering incense to the pictures on the walls. Evidently we have here some secret cult, totemistic in its nature. We are reminded of the ancient serpent worship, banished by Hezekiah, but we are also reminded that a strong Egyptian party existed in Jerusalem, the members of which may well have formed a society for the practice of Egyptian mysteries.² The idolaters are represented justifying themselves on the ground that Yahweh has forsaken the land—a significant indication of the effect which the present calamities had had on many of the people.

¹ Or does he mean those left in Canaan who seem to have survived the perils of the siege? The passage is 5¹⁻⁴. The same lesson is set forth in another way in 12¹⁻²⁰.

² Bertholet in his commentary advocates the Egyptian origin of this cult. Others think of Babylonian influence. The passage is Ezek. 8⁹⁻¹².

The horrified visitor is next taken to the north gate, and there he sees a company of women seated on the ground weeping for Tammuz. Weeping for a god who has been slain is one of the acts of worship in various religions. Tammuz is one of the gods whose myth passed over to the Greeks, among whom he is known as Adonis. His worship in Syria is very ancient and it is possible that it was naturalised in Judah at an early day. For the present reference, however, it is sufficient to assume that he was recently introduced from Babylon.¹ While this heathenism was going on, the prophet saw also a group of twenty-five men standing in the very entrance of the temple, between the vestibule and the altar. But instead of being there to worship Yahweh, they had their backs to Him, as if in deliberate insult, while their worship was paid to the rising sun. We have already read of this cult among those banished by Josiah. As if this were not enough, Yahweh declares that over the whole land similar rites send up the stench of their offerings into His nostrils.

The destruction of the city was the logical conclusion of such a state of things, and so it was shown to the prophet in his vision. Ezekiel, however, was a man to whom the justice of Yahweh was manifest in His dealing with individuals. Shall the righteous perish with the wicked? This was a question which had for some time been agitating the more thoughtful men.² Jeremiah was evidently exercised by it. Ezekiel has thought it out. He is strictly logical in affirming categorically that when the wicked are punished, the righteous will be spared. And so in his vision he hears a command given to an angel to put a mark on the righteous men in the city, that the executioners of the divine wrath may know whom to spare. When they have been marked the decree goes forth; the destroying angels slay old and young, sparing only those who have the mark in their foreheads. Then fire is taken from the altar and showered upon the devoted city. The cherubim in the celestial chariot flap their wings with thunderous sound to show that they are restive at being kept

¹ Tammuz, the favourite of Ishtar, is the god of the spring vegetation, and his death is bewailed when the powerful summer sun causes the herbs to wither—see Jastrow, *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, pp. 482 f., 547; Zimmern, in *Keilinschr. u. Altes Test.*³ II., p. 397; Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, I., p. 278 ff.

² Cf. what was said about the story of Abraham's intercession (above, p. 250.)

in such a scene. When all has been ordered, Yahweh mounts His seat and takes His departure. On the Mount of Olives He stops to take a last lingering look at His now desolate habitation, and then—away!

Jerusalem's sin has made Jerusalem's destruction inevitable—this is the constant theme of the prophet during this part of his ministry, and he enforces it in all conceivable ways. At one time the false confidence of those remaining in the city is derided. "They say of themselves: We are the flesh and this city is the caldron; the broth has been poured off, but we are safe."¹ The broth that has been poured off represents the exiles who have been carried away. Those who have escaped deportation regard themselves as the substance of the nation—bone and muscle—and they think that as the pot protects the flesh from the violence of the fire so the walls of Jerusalem protect them from destruction. The prophet states the case so as to show the absurdity.²

Ezekiel sometimes gives an unexpected turn to the parables of the older prophets. Isaiah had compared Judah to a vineyard planted by Yahweh, and we may suppose that this figure had become current among the people. That Judah is the vine and Yahweh the keeper of the vineyard would be a comforting thought in the midst of affliction. But Ezekiel puts the thought in a new light: "What is the vine among the trees? A mere twig among the trees of the forest! Is timber taken from it for any work? Is even a peg to hang things on made from it? Suppose, now, it has been thrown upon the fire and both its ends and its middle are charred; is it *then* good for anything? When it was sound it was of no use; how much less when the fire has charred it!"³ The vine of Yahweh was confessedly of no value for its fruit. But a barren vine is the most worthless of plants. Such was Judah even at its best. But now its best has been destroyed by the deportation of Jehoiachin. One cannot ascribe any value to a half-burned twig.

Less to our taste—but not offensive to oriental thought—is

¹ Chapter 11¹⁻¹². The messianic conclusion of the chapter is certainly a later insertion.

² In the later expansion of the parable (24³⁻¹²) the prophet compares those that are left in Jerusalem to the rust that clings to the caldron and which must be burned off.

³ Ezek. 15¹⁻⁵. Israel's place among the nations is a very modest one in Ezekiel's eyes.

Ezekiel's development of the prophetic metaphor in which Israel appears as the wife of Yahweh, or in which Israel and Judah appear as His wives. In Hosea, who first introduces this figure, we have a delicate self-restraint. He contents himself with declaring the unfaithfulness without going into a detailed description. Jeremiah is less refined in that he plainly compares the idolatrous passion of Judah to the blind sexual instinct of an animal. Ezekiel paints the actions of the shameless woman without reserve, as the ancient law stripped her naked and exposed her to the ribald scoffs of the vulgar. In this description¹ he not only shows more bitterness than his predecessors: his revulsion of feeling carries him so far that he condemns the whole past of the nation. Hosea and Jeremiah recognise a period when Israel was faithful—the first love of the honeymoon. Ezekiel seems to go so far as to assert that Israel was erring from the very first—her very blood was tainted, her father was an Amorite and her mother a Hittite. Even in her youth she had prostituted herself to the Egyptians.

In this sweeping condemnation of all the past, Ezekiel introduced a mode of thought which became prominent in later times. What we now note is the interest with which the exiles followed the fortunes of their native country, the certainty with which the prophet foresaw the destruction that was coming, and the pains he took to justify the ways of God to man. As the final revolt under Zedekiah was planned, the prophet was outspoken in his condemnation. The fate of the rebel was sealed by his unfaithfulness.² More of human sympathy is shown by the dirge over the unhappy princes who have been carried into captivity—the two lion's cubs trained by their mother to hunt the prey, but captured and caged, and languishing in confinement.³

The certainty of Jerusalem's fall and the justice of Yahweh in destroying it is the constant theme of this first period. As the end approaches, the prophet's cry becomes a shriek. He sees the king of Babylon marching with drawn sword. As he approaches

¹ Chapters 16 and 23.

² Chapter 17, already mentioned in connexion with the life of Zedekiah. That a cedar branch grows into a *vine* need not disturb us. The teaching of the parable is perfectly plain.

³ Chapter 19. The dirge is the most distinctly poetic of Ezekiel's compositions. The mother of the two young lions is the royal house. Some suppose, however, that the queen-mother, Hamutal, two of whose sons came to the throne (Jehoahaz and Zedekiah) is intended.

Palestine he consults his oracle,¹ to see which country he shall first attack. The oracle indicates Jerusalem, and the city's fate is sealed. The sword in Nebuchadrezzar's hand becomes Yahweh's sword, the instrument of His vengeance on a renegade people. And when the end had come the prophet was made an example to the people by his personal bereavement. The day before the news of Jerusalem's fall came to the exiles, Ezekiel's wife was suddenly taken from him by death. So great was his grief that he forgot the conventional mourning customs, and sat like one turned to stone. And when the people manifested their surprise, he came to the consciousness that he was only a sign and a parable. Great as was his grief, so great should theirs be. And so it turned out. A fugitive from Jerusalem made his way over the long desert road, and brought the terrible news that Jerusalem had indeed fallen, and that Temple and dwellings had been destroyed. Personal bereavement was in the message for many, for they had relatives and friends in the far-off land. But their grief was more than personal. They had lost home, and native country, and hope, and the God in whom they had trusted.²

For those who were not permanently alienated from the religion in which they had been brought up, this crisis laid a new duty upon Ezekiel. Hitherto his message had been mourning and lamentation and woe. It was now time to comfort those who had been smitten, and to bind up the hearts that had been broken. From this time on he not only changes the tone of his message, but he speaks with a freedom which he had not hitherto known. We may well suppose that during the period when he was dreading the calamity which he foresaw, when also his people heard him with incredulity, he would often find it impossible to speak his mind. During this period he had long fits of silence, which seemed to come from a real physical inability. When the word of Jerusalem's fall came, the nervous shock seems to have affected him physically, so that this debility troubled him no longer. He had also the advantage of fulfilled prophecy on his side. The false prophets and the necromancers who had contradicted and blasphemed were thoroughly silenced. He himself could speak as one who was accredited by the Almighty.

The first danger was the danger of despair and its consequent

¹ By the divining arrows, Ezek. 21²¹⁻²³.

² *Ibid.* 24¹⁵⁻²⁷. The paragraph rightly closes the first division of the book.

apathy. The people were now sure that they were rejected by Yahweh. In a certain sense Ezekiel had contributed to this impression. He had insisted that the guilt of the people was responsible for their calamity. Judah was ruined because she had been incurably unfaithful. This was in line with the threatenings of the earlier prophets and with the Book of Instruction. The land of Yahweh had been desecrated, and was therefore given over to destruction.¹ The despair of the people was the logical result of this teaching: "Our iniquities and our sins weigh us down, and we are rotting away in them" is their cry. The disease was incurable, because its roots in the past could not be reached. Or they put it in another way in a saying which passed from mouth to mouth: "The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge." The case was one of inherited guilt. The present generation must suffer for the sins of those who had preceded.²

When the traditional doctrine thus became a source of weakness, Ezekiel did not hesitate to combat it in the most forcible language he could command. In his vision of the sins of Jerusalem, he had refused to believe that the righteous would perish with the wicked. So sure of his ground was he that he shut his eyes to the facts of common life. In this immediate connexion indeed he seems to admit an exception, perhaps on the theory that the exception proves the rule. The people who actually escaped destruction at the fall of Jerusalem and who joined the exiles in Babylon, did not answer his description. So he affirmed that in this case Yahweh had spared a few of the sinners in order, by actual sample, to convince the exiles of the quality of their people. In this way alone could they be convinced that the punishment was deserved.³ Allowing this exception, however, he yet makes the most sweeping declaration—"all souls are mine; the soul of the father as well as the soul of the

¹ In addition to what has already been cited, note chapter 6, against the mountains of Israel.

² Ezek. 33¹⁰. Chapter 18 which treats the subject most thoroughly is now among the earlier prophecies, and we may suppose that the saying which furnishes the text was coined before the fall of Jerusalem and in view of the first deportation. But the order of the discourses in this section is not original, and this chapter was probably inserted out of its chronological position.

³ *Ibid.*, 14²¹⁻²⁸.

son. He that sins shall die. A man who is righteous and acts justly shall live. But if he begets a son who is lawless and a shedder of blood—the son certainly shall not live, he shall die a violent death, and his blood shall be on himself.”¹ The reverse case is also presented. The bad father may beget a good son. The rule (according to the prophet) applies with equal certainty—the good son lives because of his own virtues; the bad father is not advantaged by his son’s merits any more than the son is condemned for his father’s vices. Every man is treated strictly according to his individual conduct.

We readily see how Ezekiel came to advocate so one-sided a theory. Now that the blow had fallen he was making every effort to encourage his people. What he meant to enforce was the possibility of repentance even in the worst extremity. While there is life there is hope. Yahweh has no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but that he turn from his ways and live. And that life and death are, in the prophet’s view, physical life and death is obvious. The world beyond the grave gave him no prospect of rewards and punishments. If he were to find justice in Yahweh’s dealings with men, he must find it in this life. Under these limitations we see how his theory of individualistic retribution was a logical necessity.

Before leaving the chapter we are considering, we may notice the nature of the righteousness which Ezekiel demands. We have already seen that his tendency is ritualistic. We expect him to emphasise the people’s departure from the true worship. And so he does. In each case he puts among the sins of which men may be guilty *eating upon the mountains*, by which he means violation of the Deuteronomistic injunction of one altar. But it is also noticeable that he preserves the good old prophetic tradition which regards sins against one’s neighbour as sins against God. Adultery, oppression, extortion, usury are the things which bring wrath upon the one who practises them, while restoration of pledges, distribution to the needy, clothing the naked, giving honest judgment between man and man, are the things which characterise the righteous man and which bring him Yah-

¹ The whole of chapter 18 is devoted to the development of this theory. There is no attempt at argument, only repeated affirmation of the same thing. The prolixity of the treatment shows how the prophet was wrestling with his thought.

weh's favour. So when he closes his list of virtues with *walking in Yahweh's statutes and keeping His ordinances* we must interpret the language according to the general tenor of his thought. He stands, in fact, upon the basis of the Book of Instruction. The idea of a ritual law is foreign to him, though he himself gave the stimulus to the formulation of such a law.

Returning now to the doctrine of retribution—a doctrine which gave later thinkers many an hour of internal conflict—we may notice that for Ezekiel's contemporaries it did have a salutary effect. They stood at the parting of the ways. The old national religion could not endure after the death of the nation. If men were to retain any religion at all (aside from the crass heathenism which tempted them on all sides), they must learn to come individually into relation with their God. Of course the individual Judaite had always a dim consciousness of this relation. And in the great religious leaders, this consciousness was more than dim—it was a vivid realisation of the presence of Yahweh. This we are sure of in such a man as Isaiah. But these men stood in an official relation to Yahweh as His mouthpieces. The officers and courtiers are in personal intercourse with their monarch, whereas the nation at large can claim no such privilege. The older prophets had preached on the basis of Yahweh's relation to the nation as a whole. They scarcely raise the question whether the individual can have any apportionment of fate except as he shares the lot of the whole nation. Even Jeremiah, though he has been called the discoverer of individual religion, does not get beyond this. His individual and personal relation to Yahweh is beyond doubt. But the thought which oppresses him and with which he agonises is that in spite of this intimacy he is involved in the fate of his people.

With Ezekiel the circumstances forced a new consideration of the problem. The individual comes to the front when the nation is no more. The prophet boldly declares that each man has his fate in his own hands; each is directly responsible to Yahweh. The supremacy of this thought in later Judaism needs no demonstration. The measure of Ezekiel's insistence upon his doctrine is the rigidity with which he applies it to himself. In the instruction which he receives concerning his office we see this finely brought out. He regards his office as that of a watchman on the city walls—not to call the whole city to arms, but

to warn the individual of his danger. We think of the walled town liable to attack from guerilla bands. The watchman on the wall, as he sees the dust-cloud on the horizon, cries out to the travellers approaching the gates, so that they may make haste and gain the place of safety. If the sword threatens and the alarm is given and the unheeding loiterer is overtaken and slain, then his death lies at his own door. But if the watchman neglects his duty, gives no warning, lets the unsuspecting traveller fall into the hands of the enemy, then the watchman will be held responsible—the blood is upon his head.¹ The doctrine of personal accountability could be no more strongly put. The work of the prophet is the care of souls, and for each of those committed to him there will be a reckoning according to the measure of his opportunity.

What has been said will show something of the ferment of new ideas which began to work among the exiles. Ezekiel's importance as the exponent of these ideas is evident. But his influence does not stop with these. Such a man could not be without hopes for the future. The justice of Yahweh might be indicated by the punishment of His rebellious people. But this could not be the end of history. He might temporarily withdraw from a Temple too polluted for His dwelling; but the mind refused to think of Him as for ever dwelling apart from those who love and worship Him. This would be an abdication of His place as God of the whole earth, an abandonment of His world to the very rivals who had excited His jealousy. He must have plans for the future.

Such thoughts enable us to follow with something like sympathy the constructive work which Ezekiel has left on record in the second part of his book, and which, viewed apart from the man and his time, has so often puzzled the student. The general thought which we must bear in mind is the restoration of Israel in a new and purified commonwealth. The motive of such a restoration on the part of Yahweh is the vindication of His name. The fact that He had punished His own people was misunderstood by the heathen. They thought Him too weak or too indifferent to protect His own. For His name's sake, therefore, and not because of any merit in His people, He will undertake a restoration. And the thoroughness with which He will do this is seen in the

¹ Ezek. 3¹⁵⁻²¹, 33¹⁻¹⁶.

elaborateness of Ezekiel's scheme. The subject is treated in three divisions. First comes the restoration of the people to their land ; then, the treatment of the heathen aggressors ; finally, the organisation of the new nation in such a way as to guard against the errors of the past. The whole is appropriately prefaced by the chapter on the prophet as watchman which we have already considered, and by a warning to the people to be doers of the word and not hearers only.¹

Without confining ourselves strictly to the prophet's own order we may look at the details of his picture. First of all it should be noticed that he expects the total duration of the exile to be forty years.² This is, of course, a round number ; but he probably expects the generation that follows his own to see the return.

The land of Judah must first be restored, for the curse of Yahweh has fallen on the soil. Hence we find a promise that the mountains are to be visited and that new fruitfulness is to be their portion for the sake of Israel and for the sake of Yahweh's name—for the nations say: "This is Yahweh's people, yet they had to leave His land." But this desolate land will be made like the garden of Eden.³

More than fruitfulness of soil is necessary for the happiness of a people. This had been proved by the old days, both in Israel and Judah. "Where wealth accumulates and men decay" was the standing characterisation of Israel's prosperity on the part of the prophets. A just government is necessary, or the fairest lands will languish. Ezekiel is quite aware of this and sets it before us in a chapter devoted to the shepherds of Israel. The shepherds should care for the flock—so should the rulers care for their people. The monarchy is in its very idea an institution that defends the weak against the powerful. Too often the king becomes a new oppressor, taking the part of the rapacious noble against the oppressed peasant. Such had been the case in Judah, as

¹ That Ezekiel was nerved for greater activity by the news of the fall of Jerusalem is indicated in this chapter—even his physical debility seems to have been removed (33²²). That his prestige was increased we have had occasion to note. He had, however, the common experience of preachers—in the willingness of his hearers to be entertained, and their unwillingness to practice what he preached (33³⁰⁻³³).

² The prophet lies on his side forty days—a *day for a year*—to bear the sin of Judah (4⁶).

³ Ezek. 36^{20, 35}; cf. also 34²⁶⁻³⁰.

Ezekiel had seen exemplified in the case of Jehoiakim. The shepherds had fed themselves and not the flock. They had not defended the flock from enemies without, nor had they kept the peace within the fold. Among sheep as among men the strong crowd the weak out of the best pasture, keep them from the water, wantonly foul and mar what was intended for the good of all. Such a king as Jehoiakim must be made impossible in the future. Yahweh will make such a king impossible by Himself assuming the government and taking the part of the oppressed. The human monarch is to remain (as we shall see) but he is to be shorn of his power to oppress.¹ The new David is to be not king but prince—a title which Ezekiel consistently gives him throughout his discussion.

And now for the foreign nations—how much heart-break they had occasioned the true believers. They were doing Yahweh's will, to be sure, and yet they were moved by their own evil passions. Has the justice of Yahweh nothing to do with them? Isaiah has already answered that when Yahweh has made due use of Assyria as the instrument of His chastisement, He will punish the pride of its stout heart. So it had come to pass, for Assyria had fallen; but the new scourge had been as godless as the old. There must be a day of vengeance for him also and for all who had taken part in the spoliation of Judah. This we must suppose to be Ezekiel's faith, and he does not hesitate to express it. Curiously, he nowhere denounces the Babylonian power. Was he afraid of the police? Or did he think it unwise to arouse hopes among his countrymen that might lead to unrest and sedition? Or was he impressed with the good order and prosperity the exiles were enjoying under Nebuchadrezzar, so that he regarded the magistrate as the power ordained of God? We ask in vain. What stands out prominently is the enmity which the prophet feels against Edom. This can readily be accounted for by the fact that Edom was Judah's nearest neighbour, rejoiced most openly over her fall, and hastened to invade her weakened territory. In revenge the prophet declares that Edom's land shall become a desert.²

¹ Chapter 34. Yahweh the good shepherd is a common figure in the Old Testament. Perhaps the earliest passages are in Jeremiah.

² Chapter 35 appropriately forms the preface to the promise to the mountains of Israel. I have purposely left out of view the group of prophecies

Instead of insisting on the separate punishment of the various nations which have been hostile to Judah, Ezekiel rises to a grander conception. The peace of Yahweh's land had been disturbed by more terrible powers than Edom or Moab. In the far north was a reservoir of barbarians whence the Scythian armies had poured forth to desolate the face of the civilised earth. Not until they had been taught a lesson by the signal judgment of God could these barbarian hordes be expected to refrain from further attacks. The prophet had himself in his boyhood heard of these invaders as a present terror. Yahweh's name would be best vindicated by a new irruption visibly checked by His intervention. So we read the prophecy of Gog, and find in it the summing up of all that Yahweh can be expected to do against all the Gentiles. Gog¹ is the leader of the heathen powers, especially those terrible ones in the north and east.² He is the incarnation of hostility to Israel. His army is held in reserve for the last great crisis in history. When the time comes he is to be led forth by the will of Yahweh and make the final invasion of Israel's land: "After many days thou shalt receive a commission; at the end of years thou shalt come against a land recovered from its desolation, against those gathered from many nations who dwell in security, all of them. Thou shalt come up like a storm, like a cloud to cover the land, thou and all thy hordes."³ In all this—as was the case with Assyria—the invader is moved by his own evil desires. He sees Israel dwelling in unwall'd villages and thinks to find an easy prey. But the people that trust in Yahweh shall not be put to shame. Their deliverance will be sure, and so signal that none can misinterpret it. By a great earthquake a panic will be brought upon the invader against the foreign nations which now form the middle section of the book (chapters 25–32) because I am not satisfied that in their present form they are by Ezekiel.

¹ Gog and Magog, the phrase which is found in the New Testament (Rev. 20⁸) and which has passed over into Christian and Mohammedan tradition, is due to a misunderstanding.

² It is strange to find Nubia and Libya in his armies. Probably there is some corruption of the text which originally named two northern or eastern nations; cf. Toy in his edition of the text (Haupt's *Sacred Books of the Old Testament*).

³ Ezek. 38³. That the hosts of Antichrist, or of the hostile world-power, are held in reserve for the last great Day is a common feature in Christian and Mohammedan tradition.

vader. As in the Midianite army at the time of Gideon, each man's sword will be against his fellow. The slaughter will be completed by pestilence, and by a hail of fire and brimstone from heaven.

The first advantage of this programme is that it vindicates the earlier prophets. Ezekiel had before him predictions of disaster on the enemies of Israel which had not been fulfilled. By their non-fulfilment the name of Yahweh had suffered—as though He were unable to carry out what He had threatened. Not only will this reproach be removed by the great Day that is to come, but Yahweh's name will be revered over the earth: "That the nations may know me, in that by thee I show my divinity before their eyes."¹ His power and His care for His people will be universally recognised.

We must not leave this prophecy without noticing one characteristic of Ezekiel which it brings into great prominence. This is his carefulness in matters of detail, and especially on the side of ritual. After the annihilation of the hosts of Gog, the land is covered with their corpses. These are repulsive not only to sense and sight, but also to religion, for the religion of Yahweh stamps the dead as unclean; contact with them unfits a man for worship. Special pains must be taken, therefore, to remove every vestige of the great slaughter. Ravenous birds and beasts are allowed to act as scavengers. But it is ordained that when these have wrought their work, a great valley shall be chosen on the other side of the Jordan, whither shall be carried all that remains. This work will occupy seven months, and, in order that it may be thorough, inspectors are to be appointed to go through the land, and mark every bone not yet disposed of. A final gleanings will then remove every trace of pollution.²

The practical and prosaic sense of Ezekiel in the midst of this grandiose description is manifested by his theory of the captured arms of Gog and his host. These arms are of no use to Israel

¹ "In that I show myself *holy* before their eyes" gives a wrong impression. Holiness as the word is commonly understood is a moral attribute. What the prophet has in mind is rather one of the natural attributes (to speak theologically)—the superhuman power of Yahweh. For this reason I translate *show my divinity* instead of *sanctify myself*, or *show myself holy*. Yahweh's holiness is precisely that quality which makes Him different from man, His divinity. The passage is 38¹⁶.

² Ezek. 39⁸⁻¹⁵.

because it is a peaceful nation. Consisting of spears, bows, arrows, and clubs, these weapons will furnish Israel with fuel for the space of seven years. This feature of the prediction is, of course, not purely economic. The length of time taken in consuming these weapons, as well as the length of time required for the burial of the bodies, is designed to impress the reader with the greatness of the catastrophe. To the little band of exiles such a judgment upon the Gentiles would indeed prove the greatness of their God. In fact, the hope of such a great cataclysmic interference in the history of the world has sustained oppressed and persecuted believers in many a dark hour from Ezekiel's time onward. The last judgment, the end of the age, the battle with Antichrist, the great Day—this is a conception which is coming to the front continually in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. Its definite formulation we owe to Ezekiel.¹

It needs no demonstration that Ezekiel in all this is thinking strictly of a restored Israel on earth. His imagination does not reach to a new heaven and a new earth, still less to a spiritual heaven of everlasting bliss. This needs to be borne in mind in considering another vision of his, which has quite as powerfully influenced later theology—the vision of dry bones. In this vision the prophet is brought into a valley filled with human bones from which the flesh has long since disappeared. He is made the herald of the divine will, and as he pronounces the words of which he is the organ, bone seeks out his fellow-bone, sinews and flesh come upon the articulated frames, breath comes into the new-formed bodies, and instead of the mass of fragments, a great army of living men stand upon their feet.² All that the prophet received by this vision, and all that he intended to convey to his contemporaries was an assurance that the dead nation should live. Judah did indeed seem dead beyond the possibility of resurrection. The exiles avowed in so many words, that they were only the dry bones of a once-living organism, that their hope had perished, that their ruin was a present fact. The promise is given to those who

¹ The Day of Yahweh was to the older prophets (as we have seen) a day of judgment upon Israel. Ezekiel revives the old popular view that it was a visitation upon Israel's enemies. His originality is seen in the definiteness with which he presents his picture. In its earliest form the conception is mythological.

² Ezek. 37¹⁻¹⁰. The later doctrine of the resurrection of the dead was no doubt mightily helped by the vividness of this picture.

speak and feel in this way. The word is: "I will bring you out of your graves and will bring you to the land of Israel . . . and will put my spirit in you and you shall live." Such a work of national restoration would be as great a miracle as to restore the dry bones to life.

Ezekiel's hope, then, expressed itself very definitely along these lines: there is to be a restoration; the nation will revive; it will be put into possession of Yahweh's land; the land itself will be renovated; by a signal judgment the heathen will be taught Yahweh's power and will respect His people's peace and integrity. But a troublesome question still remains: Can the Israel of the future be trusted to do any better than the Israel of the past had done? On this point the prophet must have had many misgivings. He and his contemporaries were led by their experiences totally to condemn the old Israel. He does not hesitate to say that the bride of Yahweh had been adulterous from her youth. This is the attitude of later Judaism—which here again shows the strength of Ezekiel's influence. Suppose, now, that the nation is restored according to promise. What is to prevent its going astray again? Ezekiel is aware, as all theologians are aware, that the natural heart cannot be trusted. It needs the special grace of God if it is to be kept in the right way. The assurance that the failure of the past will not be repeated in the future must come from Yahweh Himself. And so at the forefront of his renewed Israel the prophet puts a promise of gracious influence in the heart of man: "I will give you a new heart, and will put a new spirit within you; I will take away the heart of stone, and will give you a heart of flesh; I will put my spirit within you, and will cause you to walk in my statutes, and you shall keep my judgments and do them."¹ Without such gracious intervention the history of the past would repeat itself.

One would think that this were sufficient. When it is God that works in us to will and to do of His good pleasure we may be trusted to work out our own salvation. But like most religious

¹ Ezek. 36²⁶; cf. 11¹⁹. I suppose the similar promises in Jeremiah (24⁷, 31³³, 32³⁹) to be later insertions in that book and dependent on Ezekiel, rather than the reverse. The complaint of the prophets concerning the hardness of their hearers' hearts, was a complaint of stupidity of brain, and the promise must be interpreted accordingly—the people will become quick to apprehend the word of God.

leaders, Ezekiel reasons in another way. The spirit may be willing but the flesh is weak. Therefore the flesh must be helped by those external and ceremonial regulations which will prevent at least external violations of the law. There must be organisation and government—this is the key to the great concluding vision of Ezekiel's book. And this government must be ecclesiastical rather than civil—this we may understand from the prophet's antecedents and from his observation of civil government.

It is a concession to tradition that there is to be a monarch. But the monarch is to be shorn of most of his power, as we have already seen.¹ He becomes, in fact, the nursing father of the Church and even that only to a limited degree. He is to receive a very considerable landed property in the new division of the country. This is to secure him a sufficient income so that he will not need to levy taxes—the oriental feeling always has been that the monarch is rich enough to give presents rather than to exact them. The prince, as he is consistently called by Ezekiel, is to have power to levy one small and strictly limited tax and this he must apply to the support of the daily worship, and of the festival offerings.² To guard against his intrusion in matters of religion he is treated as a layman and not even allowed to enter the sanctuary. He is apparently to take cognisance of civil affairs, as he is exhorted to see that a uniform standard of weight and measure is enforced. But his jurisdiction is not supposed to be very extensive because so many cases are reserved for the arbitration of the priests.

Furthermore, we have to note that the new commonwealth is simply an adjunct to the restored Temple of Yahweh. To prevent the old tribal jealousies, the land is to be divided anew among the twelve tribes. All Israel is to be located in Canaan proper, between the Jordan and the sea. The exposure of the transjordanic country to contamination from the desert is, perhaps, the reason for this. The increased fruitfulness of the land will compensate for the restricted area. Each tribe is to have a

¹ In 34²³ we find a promise that a new David shall rule over the reunited Israel. I doubt, however, whether this is Ezekiel's own declaration. Some similar Messianic sections in the early part of the book seem also to be later insertions.

² An income-tax in kind—one-sixtieth part of the grain crop, one per cent. of the oil and one-half per cent. of the cattle—is assessed by the prince, and from this he is to furnish the various offerings, 45¹³⁻¹⁷, and 46¹³⁻¹⁵.

strip across the country. Judah and Benjamin are to exchange places in order the better to obliterate the old lines of division. Between these two important tribes will be the Temple.

The expectation of Yahweh's interference for His people is carried so far as to include the physical transformation of the country. The new Temple will be located on an exceeding high mountain. Here Ezekiel sees it in vision, and so changed is the topography that he does not at first recognise the building.¹ The great structure will form a unit of itself, isolated from the city of which it has been heretofore a part. Immediately about the sanctuary the priests will receive their allotments of ground, the more effectually to separate city and Temple.

The elaborate measurements of the new sanctuary need not be reproduced here. The central building is to be on the plan of the old one which had been destroyed. Instead of the single court in which that one originally stood, this will have two, an outer and an inner. Entrance to the inner is prohibited to any but the priests and Levites. Even the prince is allowed to come only into the gateway to see his sacrifices offered. A wall ten feet high and ten feet thick surrounds the whole structure, and one of similar massiveness separates the outer from the inner court. Each is provided with gateways, and each gateway is arranged to accommodate a considerable guard.

What is the reason for all this elaborate fortification and regulation? The reason is given by the writer. In the old days Yahweh had been constantly offended by trespassers on His holiness. We have already had occasion to notice that this word was used to denote a physical, rather than a moral attribute of the divinity. To understand the attitude of Ezekiel and his contemporaries we need to remember that all things could be divided into the two classes, sacred and profane. One class (the sacred or holy, as we have the word rendered in our translations) was fit for the worship of Yahweh, either naturally or because it had been consecrated to Him. The other class was not fit to be brought before Him and was likely to arouse His wrath. The danger of offending Him was reason for the utmost caution in

¹The great vision—chapters 40-48—begins with this statement. Other Old Testament passages which speak of the Mount of the House being lifted above the mountains (Is. 2² and the parallel in Micah) are probably dependent on Ezekiel.

approaching His presence. The danger was greatest when it was a question between Him and another god. Of old He was known to be a jealous God who could brook no rivals. What was dedicated to another deity was therefore especially abhorrent to Him.

Now almost everything which is not dedicated to Yahweh is liable to fall under the power of another god. To the average man of ancient times the world was full of gods (demons, cobolds, jinn, are only gods of the second class). Even so late a writer as Augustine is able to show that every act and exigency of life was brought into relation with some god.¹ What was true of the Roman world was even more true in the distant East a thousand years earlier. Ezekiel, like all who took the will of Yahweh seriously, was weighed down by the thought of how easy it was to infringe the holiness of Yahweh. Prominent among the duties of the priests, therefore, is the instruction of the people concerning the distinction between things sacred and profane.

Even moral offences—and we have seen that Ezekiel set up a high moral standard—were viewed in the same light as offences against the holiness of Yahweh. Violations of the will of Yahweh were all in the same category. Where we distinguish between moral and ceremonial requirements, Ezekiel made no difference. These requirements were partly recorded in the Book of Instruction; but they were also in part a matter of priestly tradition.

As an example of what is meant, we may cite the prophet's specification concerning the burial of the kings of Judah. The Temple of Solomon was in immediate connexion with the palace. In accordance with ancient custom the bodies of the kings of Judah were buried in the palace—in the part of the palace adjoining the Temple. So we are told explicitly by Ezekiel himself.² After what was said above about the pollution of corpses, we understand fully the offence which was given by this custom. We may go further and say that even to a late day the manes were worshipped in Judah, and so the burial of the kings near the Temple brought alien divinities into the very presence of Yahweh. It is considerations such as these which induce Ezekiel

¹ *De Civitate Dei*, IV, 8–II.

² Ezek. 43^{1f}. On the taboo communicated by dead bodies, cf. Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, I, p. 169 f.

to remove the Temple from the city, or, better, to remove the city from the Temple, and to put between them the consecrated persons, the priests.

New regulations are published for the priests themselves, based on the same reflection—possibly also to some extent on tradition. The priests are greatly limited in their mourning customs. It was impossible wholly to do away with expressions of grief which had become established in usage, even though they were animistic in origin, but what could be done, Ezekiel enjoined. In like manner he gave new regulations concerning the dress of the priests. More important, and indeed revolutionary, was the new stipulation concerning the *personnel* of the Temple service. It had been the custom of the kings of Judah—so we discover from the passage under consideration¹—to make presents of slaves to the Temple. These were captives taken in war, we may suppose, uncircumcised in heart and uncircumcised in flesh as Ezekiel calls them: that is, being foreigners, they had no interest in the service to which they were bound, and they also lacked in their flesh the sign which should show their consecration to Yahweh. Their presence in the Temple must be an offence to Yahweh and such an abuse must be guarded against in the future. Hence the service of the Temple, even in its most menial parts, must be in the hands of duly consecrated ministers. None but these were to enter the inner court.

The priests, however, were historically of two classes. The services of the Temple had been carried on since the time of Solomon by the family of Zadok. They were regarded as belonging to the general class of Levites, by which name the ministers of all the Yahweh sanctuaries were known. The writer of Deuteronomy knew no difference between priests and Levites. In its command to abolish the High-places, this book does not mean to have the ministers of these sanctuaries deprived of their rights as priests of Yahweh. It specifically ordains that they shall become part of the ministry of the Temple.² But it was hardly to be expected that the house of Zadok, already in possession, would surrender

¹ Ezek. 44⁶⁻¹⁵. Ezekiel does not say in so many words that these foreigners were presented by the kings, but other passages state or imply it (Ezra 8²⁰).

² Deut. 18¹⁻⁸, where all members of the tribe of Levi are regarded as having the same rights and privileges. We had occasion to notice this matter in discussing the reform of Josiah.

their prerogatives. Under pressure from Josiah the new-comers were enrolled in the Temple staff, but equality with the Zadokites could not be carried through.

Ezekiel is fully aware of the history of the case. As himself a member of the family of Zadok, he has no desire to reduce the privileges of that family. He therefore sanctions the *status quo* by a specific enactment. And this he motives by a religious theory. The Levites (he thinks), though true priests of Yahweh, have been guilty of defection from His worship in that they served the High-places. Their reduction to the lower class of ministers is a punishment for this defection. In this way what had actually taken place is theoretically justified. And the gain of thus regulating the service of the sanctuary is great. The uncircumcised Temple slaves may now be abolished. The whole of the sacred service will come into the hands of consecrated persons. There will be no violation of the holiness of Yahweh, the work of the sanctuary will be better done, and the needy Levites will be provided for. The tendency to give a special consecration to those who perform even menial offices in sacred places is noticeable in other religions as well as in Judaism. Attention should be called in this connexion to the fact that Ezekiel, familiar as he is with priestly ideals and priestly tradition, nowhere mentions Aaron as in any way the ancestor or founder of the priestly family.

The millennium of Ezekiel's dreams, therefore, was a church-state whose constitutive fact was the dwelling of Yahweh in the midst of His people. In order to attain this all these precautions were necessary—the priests to offer sacrifice, the Levites to guard the doors and care for the house, the prince to supply the offerings, the people to worship at a distance. The main business of this church was to keep itself unspotted from the world. This means no doubt to avoid sin, for transgression of the will of Yahweh, whether in morals or in ritual, is violation of His holiness. But all is looked upon from the ritual rather than the ethical point of view.

It would seem as if all these precautions, with the help of the people's renewed heart, would be enough. Not so thought the prophet. In a world where so much must be classed as profane the possibilities of defilement are constantly present. Special rites of purification must therefore be observed at stated times. One

can hardly be too scrupulous, for an unwitting violation of the rules for holiness may bring down the wrath of Yahweh. With the best will in the world one may come into contact with that which is ritually defiling. Even the priest is not exempt from such contagion. The sanctuary itself or its vessels may be affected by it. To prevent so disastrous a state of things, a special class of offerings is now brought into prominence. These are the so-called sin offerings, which have special efficacy in removing ceremonial defilement.

These offerings are found in early Semitic religion, where they are expiatory in the strict sense of the word. When the god is angry and blood alone will satisfy him, a victim is brought and slain at his altar. His anger being cooled, the old relations are resumed between him and his worshippers. In Israelitish religion we may suppose such offerings not unknown, though they were always rare. The fact which had early impressed itself on the memory of the people was that the blood of a victim restores the lost communion with Yahweh. Exactly how it does this was not reflected upon. The calamities of Judah made it necessary that the people should reflect on the means to be taken to recover the favour of Yahweh. The means were at hand in the ancient sin offering, which Ezekiel therefore makes prominent. Every six months (he ordains) the consecration of the sanctuary is to be renewed by a special sin offering.¹ In this way the continued presence of Yahweh will be assured. In the prominence which Ezekiel gives to this class of offerings he is again the forerunner of Judaism.

To complete our discussion of Ezekiel's commonwealth we need to notice the river which he sees issuing from the sanctuary. This river, which was suggested to him by the fountain which flows at the base of the actual Temple hill, is to run down the great gorge of the Kedron and into the Dead Sea. So abundant will be its supply that it will transform this lifeless body of water into a fresh-water lake whose waters will swarm with fish and whose shores will cease to be desert. Ezekiel had no mystical or allegorical meaning hidden behind this vision. It was to him only a part of the programme for increasing fertility in the promised land. The Dead Sea and the wilderness of Judah were to be made to do their part in sustaining the people. So distinctly

¹ Ezek. 45¹⁷⁻²⁰.

prosaic and economic is he that he allows the salt marshes to remain in order that the people may be supplied with salt.¹

From our point of view the limitations of Ezekiel are so obvious that it is easy for us to underrate him. We see in him a man intense but narrow; his ideals are formal, liturgical; his dogmatism leads him to shut his eyes to the facts of experience. But with all this we can see not only that he was the man for the time, but that his power came from his sterling moral qualities. He was intensely in earnest; he was saturated with the idea of his own and his people's responsibility; he was faithful to duty when all the world (his world) was against him. When the tide turned and his predictions were justified by the event, he showed nothing of pride or vainglory. If he was pessimistic when others were hopeful, he showed most hope when they were hopeless. No sooner did the calamity fall than he began the work of up-building. And this he did with a sincere love for souls, watching for them as one that should give account. The system which he evolved was no doubt narrow and exclusive. But we see no way in which Judaism could have been carried through its crisis, no way in which it could have been preserved for its future mission, except by becoming for the time being narrow and exclusive. The framework provided by Ezekiel in his vision became an ideal toward which his countrymen could work. And as they began to realise it, even in their exile, it gave them coherence and staying power. Ezekiel was the father of Judaism. The child was tempted, when it got its growth, to disown the relationship. But we are able to see to whom it owes its being. To say that he is the father of Judaism means that he is the father of legalism. The prophets in general may be said to have prepared the way for the great casuistic system, by which the Jews have lived so many centuries. They were constantly preaching obedience as the condition of life. But this preaching crystallised in Ezekiel. He (following in the footsteps of Deuteronomy) laid down a system of duties, religious as well as

¹ Ezek. 47¹⁻¹². How far Ezekiel expected his vision to be literally fulfilled is a point on which the interpreters are divided. All the indications seem to me to show that he supposed it would be literally fulfilled. As to the details of the interpretation the reader may consult the recent commentaries, and especially Stade, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, II, where maps and plans are given.

moral, by which the people might hope to live in the continued enjoyment of the divine favour. And as he raised legalism to a system, so he inaugurated the apocalyptic school of thought which has so powerfully influenced Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. His vision of the future was one that could never be realised, but it gave an outline of that good time coming which oppressed souls are always looking for, an outline which they were able to fill in, allegorise, or spiritualise, as met the need of their times. Taking him all in all it is not too much to say that Ezekiel is the most influential man that we find in the whole course of Hebrew history.

Ezekiel's latest prophecy is dated in the year 571 B.C., and we may suppose that his death occurred not long after. He had taken pains to put some part of his life's work into written form, and he had founded a school whose influence extended and carried on what he had begun. Through all these years the Judaites seem to have had peace under the reign of Nebuchadrezzar. This monarch had devoted himself to the adornment of his capital, planning and carrying out the great works which made Babylon a wonder of the world. His own inscriptions tell of the number and magnificence of the palaces and temples which he built, and of his rebuilding those city walls of which Greek writers have so much to say.¹ More important for the prosperity of the country were the moats and canals which protected the fields from inundation, or carried the water to them when needed. On the death of Nebuchadrezzar his son Evil-merodach² came to the throne. He it was who released Jehoiachin from his long imprisonment, and gave him a place at court. We hear nothing of the effect which this release had on the Jews in Babylonia. It can scarcely be supposed that the Babylonian monarchs gave much thought to the little band of exiles. They, on their part, were probably content to escape observation. They were learning to live among the Gentiles, as in the great world and yet not of it—a lesson that was to prove useful to them for a long time

¹ The inscriptions are contained in the *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek*, III, 2, pp. 10–71. A good estimate of Nebuchadrezzar's character as a man and ruler is given by McCurdy, *History, Prophecy, and the Monuments*, III, pp. 143–159.

² Amel-marduk is the Babylonian form of the name. The Biblical writer (2 Kings, 25^{27–30}) dates the restoration of Jehoiachin in the thirty-seventh year of his captivity.

to come. The reign of Evil-merodach has nothing to claim our attention. He seems to have been a careless, ease-loving prince. After a reign of less than two years he was murdered by his brother-in-law, Neriglissar, who seized the throne. This king retained his ill-gotten power only three years, and his son, who succeeded him, was removed by a conspiracy soon after ascending the throne. Nabonidus, on whom the conspirators conferred the crown, reigned about twenty years, but they were years of loss and disintegration, during which a new and formidable power not far away was threatening Babylon.

The exiles in whom our interest is centred had, we may suppose, little appreciation of the civilisation by which they were surrounded. It was to them the expression of a religion foreign to their own, and in their eyes many of its customs must have been abominations. The defection of some of their number to this heathenism would make the remainder only more rigid in strengthening the institutions which still remained to them. They were deprived of many of the means of grace; there was all the more reason for holding on to what was left. Sacrifice could not be offered in a strange land. Even if the Temple had been standing, they could not have visited it. But some of the ordinances of Yahweh were still practicable. Two among these, because they were practicable, and because they served to emphasise the difference between Jews and Gentiles, received new importance. These were circumcision and the Sabbath. Observance of them now became a test of fidelity to Yahweh.

Circumcision was a rite originally common to a large part of the inhabitants of Canaan, with the Egyptians and other African peoples. Its original significance is now lost to us, but there is no reason to doubt that this significance was religious. Wherever we can trace the origin of other mutilations of the body—tattooings, cuttings, extraction of teeth—we find them based on religious ideas. It is probable that with the Israelites circumcision was a tribal mark, admitting boys or young men to full membership in the clan, and into communion with Yahweh. As we have seen¹ the Yahwist found a tradition that Moses provoked the wrath of Yahweh by neglecting it and that its performance upon his infant son was the means of reconciliation. This is in accordance with the early ritualistic view such as we see illus-

¹ Above, p. 66 f.

trated by the Yahwist elsewhere. The Elohist has a variant tradition. According to him the rite was introduced by Joshua at Gilgal to remove the reproach of Egypt.¹ With him, as with the Yahwist, therefore, it is a part of the popular religion. In the eyes of the prophets the rite had no special value. It is not mentioned by Amos, Hosea, or Isaiah, while Jeremiah indicates his light esteem for it as a mere fleshly ordinance. At the same time this prophet exhorts the people to circumcise themselves to Yahweh, by putting away the foreskins of their hearts.² The language will be natural if we suppose the rite to be a rite of consecration. Similar expressions in Deuteronomy³ certainly do not favour the idea that the external rite had any value in the author's eyes.

Ezekiel, indeed, made no direct regulation on the subject. But he introduced a different valuation of external rites. The whole system of clean and unclean was, in his eyes, of great importance. He takes occasion to express Yahweh's abhorrence of the uncircumcised foreigners who had been employed in His service. We may be sure, therefore, that his influence would be in favour of the retention of the rite—all the more that Israel was now living in the midst of the uncircumcised. In several passages he expresses his contempt for the uncircumcised.⁴ Where such reproach was uttered, men would take pains to avoid giving occasion for it. The Judaite who neglected the rite would soon find himself regarded with scorn by his fellows. This is the tendency that made itself felt in the exile, and which has wrought in Judaism to the present time.

The other mark of distinction was the observance of the Sabbath. This seems to have been originally a Babylonian institution, naturalised in Canaan at an early day. Cessation of labour one day in seven cannot be the thought of a nomadic or pastoral people. The life of the peasant is the one which gives opportunity for such an observance. That certain days are taboo, because of the predominance of a hostile planet, is a thought that comes with the systematic observation of the heavens such as we

¹ Josh. 5 ², ³, ⁵, ⁹. The intervening verses are a later insertion.

² Jer. 4 ⁴. In 9 ²⁵ Jeremiah designates the circumcised in flesh as precisely the ones that are uncircumcised in heart.

³ Deut. 10 ¹⁶, 30 ³; the latter is certainly a late insertion.

⁴ Ezek. 28 ¹⁰, 31 ¹⁸, 32 ¹⁹, ²¹, ²⁵.

find in Babylonia. The Babylonians are said to have designated the seventh, fourteenth, twenty-first, and twenty-eighth day of each month as days of possible ill-omen, in which special care should be taken concerning what one does or undertakes. The phases of the moon would seem to give reason for a notion of this kind, especially where the moon was a prominent divinity, as it seems to have been all over the East. The Old Testament mention of New Moon and Sabbath in conjunction would indicate a common origin for the two festivals. With this idea we have another. The Book of the Covenant ordains that the land shall be cultivated six years, and lie fallow the seventh. And it treats the Sabbath in connexion with this Sabbatic year.¹ Here we find the idea of the agriculturist that the land belongs to his god, and that cultivation is a trespass on the god's rights. It was on account of this belief that so much care was taken to propitiate the local divinity when new ground was brought under cultivation. Leaving the ground fallow for a portion of the time is one way of recognising the god's ownership.

We are here in the region of hypothesis. But as we know that the attributes of Baal were transferred to Yahweh, and that Yahweh was the recognised owner of the land of Canaan, it does not seem far-fetched to suppose that at least the Sabbatic year was an acknowledgment of His rights in the soil, and that the Sabbath, whatever its original connexion with the moon-god, was regarded from the same point of view. In the earlier prophets we find no emphasis laid upon the sacred day. Amos describes the extortionate merchants as observing it, but with the wish that it might pass quickly that they might resume their money-getting. Hosea mentions it as one of the joyous festivals which are to come to an end. Isaiah puts it with the New Moon and the days of assembly, but finds them all an abomination to Yahweh.²

Ezekiel takes a different tone—here again the inaugurator of a new mode of thought. Through him Yahweh says: "I gave them my statutes and taught them my judgments in which a man shall live if he do them; and also my Sabbaths I gave them *to be a sign between myself and them*, that they might know that I, Yahweh, am the one who consecrates them."³ The meaning

¹ Ex. 23¹⁰⁻¹².

² Isaiah, 1¹³, Amos 8⁵, Hos. 2¹¹.

³ Ezek. 20^{11f}, and several times in the same chapter; cf. also 22^{8, 26}, 23³⁸.

seems to be that Yahweh has separated Israel from the nations, and consecrated them to Himself by putting this mark upon them. The profanation of the Sabbath is sacrilege—like the profanation of other sacred things. A people in earnest in carrying out the idea of consecration would find strong motives impelling them to the observance of the sacred day. We are not surprised that passages originating in or after the exile lay great stress upon the day. One of the editors of Jeremiah intimates that the calamities of the house of David might have been avoided had the princes been careful in the matter of the Sabbath.¹ Other passages originating in or after the exile exhort to strict observance of the day, and the climax is reached in the time of Nehemiah or later, when desecration was punished by the civil authorities.²

Whatever we may think of the ideals cherished by Ezekiel, there can be no doubt that he gave direction to the thoughts of his people. The little band of exiles went to school to him, and he left behind pupils who could carry on his work. Like their master, these men drew a sharp line through the habits and customs of daily life. On one side, whatever by priestly or prophetic tradition was connected with the worship of Yahweh was adopted and cherished. On the other side, whatever was not thus approved was unsparingly condemned. The more thoughtful of the exiles could not help following their master in extending the line of demarcation into the past. What was now hateful to Yahweh must always have been hateful to Him. And in applying this standard it must be evident that only one verdict could be pronounced. The fathers came short in almost every particular.

But it might be edifying, nevertheless, to consider these shortcomings of earlier generations. So a new impulse was given to literature. The records that had been preserved were examined

¹ Jer. 17¹⁹⁻²⁷. The paragraph seems not to come from Jeremiah himself. It is contrary to his whole preaching. The most striking passage on the observance of the Sabbath is Isaiah, 56¹⁻⁷, post-exilic, as we shall see. From the early historical books we learn only that New Moons and Sabbaths were days for visiting the prophets, and that the Temple guard was changed on that day (2 Kings, 4²³, 11⁵⁻⁹).

² Neh. 13¹⁵⁻²². On the Babylonian origin of the Sabbath, see Jastrow's article in the *American Journal of Theology*, II, pp. 312 ff. (April, 1898), and the article "Sabbath" by Driver in Hastings's, *Dictionary of the Bible*, IV; Toy in the *Journal of Bib. Lit.*, XVIII, p. 190 ff.

afresh, worked over, and put in a new light. The literature that arose was literature with a purpose. Earlier generations might have delighted in the stories of patriarchs and judges because they were stories of adventure or of prowess. The time was now too serious for that. What could point a moral was valued just because it could be used to point a moral. The idea of literary property had not yet arisen. The material which any one found at hand he took and copied, condensed, or enlarged as suited his purpose. Fortunately for us, writers of the new school were willing to preserve their sources (so far as they preserved them at all) in their original words. The result is that we are able, in many cases, to distinguish the earlier from the later material.

We may suppose that the book of Deuteronomy was the first to engage the attention of these students. This book had become the standard of the prophetic party. Ezekiel himself had it in mind when he spoke of the statutes, judgments, and commandments given by Yahweh, by observing which a man shall live. The book had already received additions and enlargements since its first promulgation. But a code of this kind is never complete, as is shown by the whole later history of Judaism. The light of events had brought its teachings into fearful distinctness. It was only a kindness to succeeding generations to put this light into the book itself. So we see the threats made more specific by passages which could be written only in the exile. As a code of laws the book could still be amended from tradition; moreover, its place in history could be made more distinct by a historical introduction.¹ The material for this introduction was taken from the earlier history of the exodus known as J E.

The main parts of the book of Joshua were rewritten about this time from the Deuteronomic point of view. That is: the conquest of the land was viewed as complete and thorough instead of gradual and partial. We see the view of the earlier prophets here brought out—that Israel was faithful to Yahweh in the earlier time. This fidelity must have been shown, so the writer supposes, in exterminating the Canaanites in accordance with the commands of the Book of Instruction. Joshua therefore appears as the model of obedience to these commands, and

¹ Notice Deut. 29, 30¹⁻¹⁴, the unhistorical picture in 2^{31 ff.}, and the allusions to the exile in 4.

the narrative gives us exactly what did not occur at the Conquest. The book of Judges was already substantially in its present form, but an editor found it necessary to point its moral by making it show how Canaanitish influence had regularly corrupted Israel and as regularly led to disaster. It seems probable also that the farewell address of Samuel was composed at this time, and possibly the account of Saul's disobedience in not exterminating the Amalekites was now expanded from an earlier nucleus.¹ The books of Kings we know to be an excerpt from a more extended historical work, made from the Deuteronomic point of view. In the author's eyes the kings of Israel and Judah are pronounced bad or good according as they conform to the Deuteronomic standard. Tried by this standard Josiah is the only one (after David) who is fully approved. The people at large are uniformly condemned for the worship at the High-places. That the prayer of Solomon at the dedication of the Temple is the composition of an author of this school need hardly be pointed out.²

It was to be expected that other codes would be formulated besides the Book of Deuteronomy. That book was hortatory in tone and its legislation did not embody all that it was desirable to have on papyrus or parchment. Ezekiel's great idea was the consecration of the people to Yahweh and this might be more distinctly put in a convenient hand-book. Some one who thought thus wrote down a collection of laws now included within the Book of Leviticus and called the Holiness Code.³ Possibly the author did not agree with all of Ezekiel's regulations. He quite certainly desired to have some priestly traditions formulated apart from the visionary second temple.

The priest must teach the people to distinguish between sacred and profane. He must himself know what is sacred and what is profane. The Holiness Code teaches him just this. That it

¹ 1 Sam. 15. The farewell address is chapter 12.

² In making these authors exilic I do not mean to date them exactly in the thirty years between Ezekiel's death and the advent of Cyrus. The lower limit of the exile is not a fixed date, as will be shown.

³ Lev. 11 and 17-26. The critical questions are discussed by Baentsch, *Das Heiligkeitgesetz* (1893), Paton in the *Journal of Biblical Literature* (1895, 1897, and following years), and the usual hand-books. The analysis is indicated in Driver's text and translation of Leviticus (*Sacred Books of the Old Testament*).

enumerates a large number of offences against the moral law as contrary to the "holiness" of Yahweh and the people, only brings the author into accord with his predecessors. His point of view is sufficiently indicated by his frequent repetition of the phrase "I am Yahweh," or "You shall be holy for I am holy." We have already seen how fundamental in Ezekiel's thought was this distinction between sacred and profane. Its first application by the author of the Holiness Code is to the subject of foods that might be eaten.¹ Among animals the great majority were more or less distinctly associated with some god. The swine is an example. This does not mean that particular swine were set apart to the god by an act of consecration, but that the whole race was the property of that particular god—Adonis seems to have been his name. In the earliest stages of thought the animal was the god. The later uncleanness is a survival of the totemistic ascription of divinity to the animal. But an animal that was possessed by a demon could not be brought to Yahweh, or be consistently eaten by his worshippers.²

Consecration of this kind is contagious. Not only is a swine taboo (this is the most convenient word), every one that touches him becomes taboo. To come into the presence of Yahweh in this condition is as offensive as it would be to bring an idol before Him. It is probably not an accident that the animals mentioned first in the list of those forbidden are animals that play a prominent part in other religions. The camel was sacred among the Arabs. The hare is sacred in almost all early religions and has not altogether lost his supernatural character even among us.³ The coney or rock-badger belongs in the same class with the hare—the ancient observer, at least, would put them together.

It is not possible for us to go through the list and show that all the animals forbidden to the Jews had this quality of sacredness to some god. But when we remember how many animals

¹ Lev. II. The similar catalogue in Deuteronomy is probably a later insertion.

² Examples of the uncleanness of swine in other religions are given by Usener, *Sintfluthsagen*, p. 93; Wiedemann, *Religion of the Egyptians*, p. 80 (where the swine is an incarnation of Set and therefore an abomination to Horus); Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, II, p. 44 (Second Edition II, p. 300ⁿ).

³ The negro folk-tales in which the rabbit plays so prominent a part show how superhuman is his estimation, and the rabbit's foot that is carried for luck is another evidence. Arabic parallels are well known.

were worshipped by so advanced a people as the Egyptians (for example) we shall find it altogether probable that all that were taboo were taboo for the same reason.

But holiness (in the sense in which we are now discussing it) works both ways. A man may carry the contagion of uncleanness into the presence of Yahweh to his own hurt; he may also carry the contagion of Yahweh's sacred things into common life which also would be to his hurt. The highest degree of sacredness is dangerous to anyone—even the high priest must exercise special precautions in approaching what possesses it. Some things must not be eaten even by persons consecrated to the divine service—they are reserved for Yahweh alone. Among these is the blood of animals. This *ganz besonderer Saft* has always affected men with awe or horror. It is so intimately connected with the life that primitive thought identifies them. "The blood is the life" is the Hebrew assertion. But the life so evidently comes from God that to eat it would be to trespass on that which belongs to Him alone. Hence the prohibition to eat blood in any circumstances.¹ And with the blood we may class the fat of the sacrifices. This is Yahweh's portion, to eat it is to trespass on His rights and to bring down His wrath. Of some sacrifices the whole flesh was taboo, even to the priests. All this is set before us in the Holiness Code, though not so much in detail as was later found desirable.

To our conception, regulations concerning food do not belong in a divinely given law. We read with more sympathy the next chapter, for we also regard with abhorrence the sins which are there forbidden. The section deals with the subject of marriage and specifies the degrees within which marriage is prohibited, forbidding also adultery and unnatural vice.² While we find

¹ I am not saying that there may not have been even cruder ideas at the basis of the original prohibition. It may have been thought that it would be dangerous to swallow the *life* of an animal. But the Hebrew idea was strictly religious. The prohibition of blood was not a mere theoretical enactment. Blood was eaten at certain sacramental seasons by the Gentiles, and the Jews may have been tempted to follow such examples. The use of blood upon the tent or upon the door-posts of the house (as at the passover) shows the magical power that was attributed to it, as does the care taken to cover it with earth when an animal was slain at a distance from the sanctuary.

² Lev. 18⁶⁻³⁰. Paton shows that there are four pentades or two decalogues, with a concluding exhortation. The original conclusion was 19^{2b}.

ourselves at one with the author in forbidding what he forbids, our point of view is different. To us these are matters of social order. The things prohibited are contrary to God's will, no doubt, and abhorrent to Him. But to the writer they stand in the same class with the eating of meats prohibited. All are abhorrent to Yahweh because violations of His sanctity.

To understand exactly what this means, we need to go a little further back. There can be no reasonable doubt that the Canaanite Baal was the god of fruitfulness. He was therefore worshipped with licentious rites. So far as Yahweh was identified with Baal, these rites had invaded His worship. The tradition of the golden calf shows us the lascivious nature of this festival. Amos implies that prostitution went on at the altars of Yahweh. Hosea asserts that the young women of Israel gave themselves over to strangers at the sanctuaries.¹ From the time of Asa down repeated attempts were made to clear the Temple of obscene ministers to unnatural lust, whose presence and whose return when banished show how deeply the worst forms of sexual vice were imbedded in the popular religion. Ezekiel testifies in unmistakable language to the customs of Jerusalem down to the very siege of the city: "In thee they have committed lewdness; in thee they have uncovered their father's nakedness; in thee they have humbled her that was unclean in her separation; and a man has committed abomination with his neighbour's wife, and another has defiled his daughter-in-law, and another has humbled his sister, his father's daughter."² The language indicates more than occasional crimes, it indicates something habitual or periodic. The only reasonable hypothesis seems to be that at the great religious festivals held in the name of Yahweh or of some other god, there was great sexual license. The Queen of Heaven to whom Jeremiah alludes was probably worshipped by such excesses.³

¹ Hos. 4¹³; cf. Amos, 2⁷, Ex. 32^{6, 25}.

² Ezek. 22⁹⁻¹¹; cf. 18^{6, 11}. The whole subject of the influence of the sexual life upon early Semitic religion has been developed by Barton in his *Study of Semitic Origins* (1901).

³ Marriage within the prohibited degrees is alluded to in the case of a man's marrying his half-sister on his father's side, and tradition ascribes such a marriage to Abraham. The tradition may be the indication of an early system of matriarchy in which kinship was reckoned only on the mother's side. But even then the survival into a later time was immoral,

The idea of holiness (or sacredness) comes in here with great distinctness. The phenomena of the sexual life are so marked that men have always attributed them to supernatural powers. Woman was taboo at certain periods. Warriors when in actual service were forbidden to touch a woman;¹ their consecration to the god of war would be broken by touching a person sacred in another sense—sacred to one was unclean to another. The new sense of consecration to Yahweh which was aroused in the exile led to stricter regulation of all that pertained to the sexual life, especially as the religion of Babylonia sanctioned some of the abuses which had formerly taken refuge under the traditional customs of Israel. From this point of view we understand more clearly the emphasis which the Holiness Code lays upon these enactments. They represent a protest against a heathenism which had offended Yahweh in the past, and must not be allowed to rouse His anger in the future. The higher moral standard was made effective by union with ritual ideas. The term *sacred* or *holy* had not had ethical content; now it begins to have it.

It would be a mistake to suppose that the collection of these laws and their commitment to writing was undertaken in the interests of the priests alone. The sacredness of the people does indeed culminate in the priesthood. The author agrees with Ezekiel in taking special care that the priests should keep themselves ritually pure.² But the object of one as well as the other is to inform the people of what must be done by the priests as well as by themselves for the continuance of Yahweh's favour upon them. For this purpose the people must be informed what sort of sacrifices are acceptable, what restrictions are to be observed and Ezekiel in struggling toward a higher moral standard is right in condemning it.

¹ 1 Sam. 21⁴⁻⁶ from an early document. On the whole subject see Schwally, *Semitische Kriegeralttümer*, I (1901) p. 60 ff. Schwally points out that the curious regulations for warriors in Deut. 20⁵⁻⁸ are based on the sexual taboo (*l.c.* pp. 75-98). See also Frazer, *The Golden Bough*,¹ I., p. 170; II, p. 232 ff. On the sacred character of women, see Procksch, *Die Blutrache bei den vorislamischen Arabern* (1899), p. 48.

² Lev. 21 and 22. The regulations go beyond Ezekiel in excluding from the service of the altar any one of the priestly family who has a physical blemish. From analogy we may suppose that these unfortunates were supposed either to have come into the power of another god (or demon), or else that Yahweh's displeasure with them was manifested in their misfortune, in which case they would not be acceptable to Him.

served by the priests, who are to eat of the sacred things. That the author had some idea of enforcing the prerogatives of the priests is possible, though this aim nowhere comes to the front. He is genuinely interested in informing the people how Yahweh will have them live. His purpose comes out in the concluding exhortation of his tract, in which, after the manner of Deuteronomy, he lays upon the people the injunction to obey these commands. Here we find the promise of prosperity in case of obedience, while for disobedience there is the threat of sword and pestilence. And the climax is reached in the declaration: "And yourselves I will scatter among the nations . . . and your land shall be a desolation and your cities shall be a waste. Then shall the land be paid its Sabbaths, all the days that it lies desolate while you are in your enemies' land; then shall the land rest and pay off its Sabbaths."¹ The exilic point of view is distinctly visible, and the chastened temper of the people no doubt received this message with humility.

It would be useless, however, to deliver such a message unless there lay behind it a hope for the future. Such a hope was the basis of Ezekiel's preaching and it furnished the motive for all the literature of the period. The only reason for pointing out the errors of the past was to avoid their repetition in the future. But this itself implied that there was to be a future. In the exile, therefore, we must locate the beginnings of what we may call the Messianic hope. Ezekiel had gone counter to the popular desire when he so nearly ignored the king as head of his new commonwealth. The people of Judah had been under the rule of the house of David for more than four hundred years. The feeling of loyalty was strong in many hearts among the exiles. The misfortunes of recent times had moved people and monarch to sympathy with each other. The more the humiliations and privations of the present were felt, the more did the traditional glories of the founder of the dynasty come into view. There can be no doubt that David was a man of great personal charm, while his faults were not such as to diminish the affection of his people. Time had served only to deepen the impression made by him. Tradition magnified his exploits till he seemed in power and magnificence to be on a level with the great conquerors of Assyrian and Babylonian history. It was natural that the people in their

¹ Lev. 26^{33 f.} (Driver's translation.)

forlorn condition should long for a new David to restore the state to its rightful position among the nations, and to take vengeance upon the Gentiles by whom they had been so long oppressed.

This hope was nourished by the study of the older books of prophecy. These books were indeed not intended as programmes for the future. The great preachers whose words they embodied had been intent on reproof, rebuke, and exhortation of their contemporaries. They had frequently threatened calamity for the future, but this was in order to make an impression on the present. They were pointing out what every preacher must point out,—that sin is contrary to the mind of God, and that one cannot transgress the commands of a just God with impunity.

But these threats had received startling confirmation from events. The wrath of God had fallen in such ways as to emphasise the predictive element in these books. So startling a confirmation gave the books an enormous importance, and they were anxiously studied, not only that the people might draw the lesson of the divine justice, but also that they might, if possible, discover something of the divine compassion and of the divine purpose for the future. The promises made by the earlier prophets, were, indeed, few and far between. Amos seems to have had no hope for the future. Hosea's anticipations would have been equally dark had it not been for his confidence that Yahweh's love was inextinguishable. Even he left the hope to be inferred rather than gave it distinct expression. Isaiah saw that a remnant might turn, and when the crisis came felt that it would be impossible for Zion to be utterly destroyed. Jeremiah again saw only the dark side. In spite of the almost total absence of definite promise for the future, however, there always was in the prophets the conviction that Yahweh is faithful and merciful. Whenever Israel should turn to Him with all its heart, it would surely be forgiven and restored. The exiles of Ezekiel's congregation were sure that they had definitely broken with the past, and this assurance gave them a larger and more lively hope for the future. We cannot help seeing that in this condition of things the hopeful hints in the prophets would be made more definite. Some confident scribe at this time added the supplement to Amos which opens a vista of peace and prosperity for the time to come. The discourses of Isaiah were much more thoroughly worked over, though how much of the inserted

material belongs in this period, and how much to a still later time, is difficult to discover. In the book of Jeremiah, as we now read it, we find a number of similar passages which contrast strangely with the uniformly pessimistic view of that prophet. Ezekiel himself did not escape, though the insertions do not form any large part of the work.

It cannot surprise us to find that this hope expressed itself in various forms. Sometimes we have it asserting itself in connexion with the name of David. Perhaps the chapter which makes David receive a direct promise of a succession of descendants who should possess his throne for all time to come, belongs in this period.¹ We can imagine that the restoration of Jehoiachin to liberty, possibly to a shadowy title of king or prince, might suggest the chastisement which the author speaks of. At the same time there were those who followed Ezekiel in distrusting the kingdom altogether, and who hoped for a kingdom of God in which there would be no earthly king. What we need to note is that in these and in other forms, the Messianic hope began to be a part of Israel's mental and spiritual support from the exile on.

The exiles' love for the old home and their grief at its desolation is affectingly brought to view in the little book which we call by the name Lamentations. Tradition, which tries to associate every literary monument with some well-known name, has attributed its composition to Jeremiah. It cannot be by him, nor indeed is it all by one hand.² "Poems by Two Friends" would not surprise us as the title of a book in our own day; and something like it would describe the book before us. The authors treat the same theme—the fall of Jerusalem—from essentially the same point of view. They are ardent patriots expressing their grief at the calamity of their people. Jerusalem is described in the language of the prophets as a woman bereaved of her children and delivered into the hands of her enemies. The details of the picture are dwelt upon with the insistence of grief. In vivid personification the mourning mother herself speaks—appealing to the passers-by to know whether there has ever been such sorrow as hers. She confesses the sin and rebellion which

¹ 2 Sam. 7.

² Compare the careful discussion in Driver's *Literature of the Old Testament*, or the recent commentaries of Budde and Löhr.

have brought this punishment upon her. Nevertheless, the strangeness of the catastrophe baffles the mourning poet :

“ The Lord has become like an enemy ; He has destroyed Israel.

He has destroyed all her palaces ; has ruined her fortresses.

He has multiplied in the daughter of Zion mourning and woe.

Like a robber he has violated His own dwelling ; destroyed His assembly hall ;

He has made forgotten in Zion feast-day and Sabbath ;

In hot anger He has spurned both king and priest.”¹

We see how the author wrestles with the thought that Yahweh is the one responsible for the profanation of His own sanctuary. But we see also that he will not let go either his faith in Yahweh or his love for Israel. He may be called a type of Judah in exile. He shows the heart disciplined by suffering. This is made evident by the element of confession so prominent in these poems. Zion is exhorted to pray to her Lord. Not only this ; but the author himself lifts up his heart in confession and supplication. He cannot believe that Yahweh will be blind to the present suffering of His people. It cannot be that He afflicts because He delights in suffering, for He is long-suffering and gracious. It is characteristic of post-exilic Judaism that the man who prays and confesses his sin is conscious of speaking as the mouthpiece of his people. The first steps are already taken toward the ecclesiastical solidarity which finds its fullest expression in the Book of Psalms.

Whatever hopes the people had were stimulated by events in the political world. Nabonidus, the last king of Babylon, offended the religious susceptibilities of his subjects, especially of the priests, by endeavouring to centralise the worship of the provincial gods in the capital. Beyond this we know little about him. The restiveness of the Babylonians made it certain that they would welcome an invader who was strong enough to displace their king. Such a figure was rising to prominence in the east. Cyrus, King of Anshan, a small country beyond Elam, was conquering one after another of his neighbours. The most important of these was Astyages, of Media, whose domain fell to Cyrus in 549 B.C. The consolidated kingdom now appears under the title of the Medes and Persians. Its arms were next turned against Croesus, of Lydia, whose fall made such a deep impression on the Greek states. Whether Lydia was in alliance with Babylon as

¹ Lam. 2 5-6. A slight correction of the traditional text is needed in v. 6.

has been affirmed is not clearly made out. It was only in the nature of things that Cyrus should next attack the most powerful and wealthy country within his view. He was invited, moreover, by the discontented party in Babylon itself. Nabonidus remained in the city while his son Belshazzar commanded the army in the field. After this army was defeated by Cyrus the city might have defended itself a long time if its people had been united. But the party disaffected to Nabonidus opened the gates and Cyrus took possession without meeting serious opposition.

The innovations of Nabonidus had been undertaken from religious motives, as he himself claims. He rebuilt a number of temples that had fallen to decay and he put on record his prayers for the favour of the gods he so faithfully served. To the Hebrew onlookers his fall must have been proof of the inability of his gods to save. Cyrus, who in a few years had made himself master of a great empire extending from the border of India to the shores of the *Ægean*, seemed much more distinctly the favourite of the true God. But Cyrus himself had no prejudice against the Babylonian gods and was conscious of no mission against them. The only inscription which we have from him declares that Merodach, the chief god of Babylon, commanded him to invade the country, and that the god marched at his side as his friend and helper. This god gave the city into his hand without battle or skirmish, so that he was welcomed by the inhabitants. Cyrus further declares that he took care to restore to their ancient dwellings the gods whom Nabonidus had removed and he prays that Bel and Nebo may be gracious to him and intercede for him with Merodach.¹ In fact, so important a city as Babylon must influence the policy of the new king. In a certain sense it continued to be the capital of the empire. Its gods must be recognised as a matter of state policy. Only in this way could the new reign be made legitimate in the eyes of the Babylonians. Whatever religion Cyrus may have adopted as a matter of personal conviction, it is clear that he cherished no aversion to the polytheism of Babylon. If the little company of exiles had any hopes of finding a conscious agent of Yahweh in the new conqueror these hopes were doomed to disappointment.

¹ The inscriptions of Nabonidus and Cyrus are given in the *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek*, III, 2, pp. 80-137

That their hopes of release and return had been raised is made evident by two short pieces now joined into one and incorporated in the book of Isaiah.¹ The theme of the first is the attack upon Babylon by an army of fierce and cruel warriors. At the close of the poem we learn that they are the Medes, and the work they are to accomplish is an overthrow "like God's overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrha." In the second poem we have a brilliant sarcastic dirge over the King of Babylon whose destruction is expected in the near future. The quiet which the earth enjoys, now that its tyrant is slain, is shared even by the cedars of Lebanon; they are no more ruthlessly felled to provide timber for Nabonidus's building. To greet the shade of the slaughtered king the personified Sheol rouses up departed monarchs from the thrones where they sit in state. These see with astonishment one so exalted brought down to a level with them. The thought of the Babylonian monarch had been that he would be deified—that he would ascend the oriental Olympus and set his throne there among the great gods. Instead, he is treated worse than the meanest of his subjects: "Thou art cast out from thy sepulchre like an abhorred abortion, like those who are pierced with the sword; thou goest down to the lowest pit like the corpse that is trodden under foot."² The close is made by Yahweh's threat to destroy Babylon, root and branch.

Of about the same age is another fragment also preserved to us in the book of Isaiah.³ The author is deeply moved as he sees the approaching conflict. As the watcher in the desert sees the sand-storm approach so this watcher sees the band of robbers and hears the cry: "On, Elam! Attack, Media!" He looks again and a caravan approaches with the cry: "Babylon is fallen, and all the images of her gods lie broken on the ground."

These anticipations were not realised, but the hope continued and grew stronger with the years.

¹ Isaiah, 13¹–14²³. The verses 14¹⁻³ are the link, inserted later.

² Isaiah, 14¹⁹. Free emendation of the text is necessary, but the author's meaning is plain.

³ Isaiah, 21¹⁻¹⁰. The obscure verses 11-15 may belong in the same period.

CHAPTER XVI

THE REBUILDING OF THE TEMPLE

THE occupation of Babylon by Cyrus came late in the year 539 B.C.¹ It would be reasonable to expect a clear account of the history of the Jews from this time on, for we should suppose the literary tendency powerful enough to put on record what actually occurred. But the expectation is grievously disappointed. No period of the people's history is more obscure than that which comes between the advent of Cyrus in Babylon and the mission of Nehemiah to Jerusalem, unless it be the period which immediately follows the work of Nehemiah.

According to the account given in the Biblical book of Ezra, and until recently commonly accepted, Cyrus had no sooner established himself in Babylon than he issued a distinct decree that the Jews in Babylonia should be permitted to return to their own city. The decree gives the rebuilding of the Temple as the special purpose of the return ; and the king has no hesitation in avowing his motive, namely, that Yahweh, God of Israel, has given to him all the kingdoms of the earth and has commanded him to build Him a house in Jerusalem. The decree is dated by the Biblical author in the first year of Cyrus, by which he means the first full year of the possession of Babylon, in our calendar 538 B.C.

The difficulties in accepting this account as it stands, are of the most serious character. The proclamation which Cyrus is said to have issued declares that Yahweh² has given into the king's hands all the kingdoms of the earth. We have already seen that Cyrus claims Merodach, Bel, and Nebo as his patrons, and the incon-

¹ On the date see an article by E. Meyer in the *Zeitschr. f. d. Alttest. Wissenschaft* (1898), p. 339 ff. ; and the same author's *Forschungen zur alten Geschichte*, II, p. 468 ff.

² Yahweh, *God of Israel*, we should probably read with the Greek Esdras. See Guthe's text in Haupt's *Sacred Books of the Old Testament* (1901). The passage is Ezra i 1-4.

sistency of this with the alleged proclamation is obvious. The inconsistency might not be so striking in the eyes of an oriental—this we may cheerfully admit. But there is a vast difference between claiming that the patron deities of Babylon have given their own city into the king's hands and avowing that Yahweh, to him the God of one of the most obscure corners of his kingdom, has put into his power all the kingdoms of the earth. All that we know of the Persian readiness to acknowledge and protect all sorts of sanctuaries¹ does not justify the sweeping language of the proclamation.

It is quite in accord with this that the alleged proclamation is in a style unknown to the genuine edicts of the Persian kings. These monarchs call themselves "King of Armies," "King of Babylon," "Great King," but nowhere "King of Persia." This title was given to them only after the Greek conquest of the East made men contrast Alexander with his predecessors who were primarily kings of Persia.

These indications are sufficient to make us view the historicity of the account with suspicion, and we are compelled to look more closely at the whole narrative of which it is a part. The books of Ezra and Nehemiah (originally one book) are a continuation of the books of Chronicles and are by the same author. This author wrote certainly not earlier than 300 B.C.—probably considerably after that date. His distance in time from the reign of Cyrus is sufficient to prevent his having an accurate idea of what took place, unless he were careful and critical in the use of his sources of information. That he was not critical is made clear by his earlier work, where he excerpts from documents still in our possession. His method there shows us that he was under a strong theological or ecclesiastical bias which made it impossible for him to see the actual process of history. This same bias affects his view of what took place after the exile. He finds in Jeremiah a prediction that the exile is to last seventy years. He has no hesitation in asserting that the prediction was literally fulfilled by a direct act of God upon the heart of the Great King. Hence his free construction of the proclamation which (according to his logic) Cyrus must have issued on the occasion.

¹ See, for example, the inscription containing an order of Darius I to a official named Gadata, protecting the rights of a sanctuary in Asia Minor, given by Meyer, *Entstehung des Judentums*, p. 19 f.

It is not for us to sit in judgment on the Chronicler. What we need to know is how far his picture of the Persian period is reliable. It is now generally admitted that his testimony alone is of very slight historical value. Where he used other documents, these must be judged on their merits. One of these documents (the memoirs of Nehemiah) will occupy our attention in the next chapter. For the period before Nehemiah we have what seems on the surface a consistent story of the Jewish restoration. We hear how a large number of the exiles responded to the invitation of Cyrus. An elaborate list is given of those who made up the caravan. No sooner were they settled in their cities than they began the work of rebuilding the Temple. First the altar was restored and the service was resumed. Then timber was secured from the Phœnicians, and in the second year the foundations were laid. At this point the enemies of Judah and Benjamin came and asked that they might help in the work. On being asked to give account of their claims, they alleged that they were descendants of the colonists which Esarhaddon had settled in Samaria. They were not allowed to join in the work, and therefore turned against the newcomers and troubled them. Thus the work was hindered all the days of Cyrus. The form of the hindrance is indicated by the copy of a letter sent by certain foreigners in Palestine to the Great King.

According to the narrative, the work was resumed in the reign of Darius, and brought to a happy conclusion. A second endeavour to induce the king to stop it met with no success. In fact (or rather in theory), it produced a new decree in favour of the work. The restored Temple was dedicated and the Passover was observed, after which Ezra came up with the Law in his hand, and the establishment of the Law was followed by the mission of Nehemiah. This is all according to the programme which an author in the Greek period would draw up; first, the release of the Jews; then the sharp separation from the Samaritans—for these, according to the author's view, were the only people left behind when Judah was carried away; next, the building of the Temple; after that, the reintroduction of the Law; and finally, the rehabilitation of the city by the rebuilding of the walls.

But history does not usually move along the lines we mark out for it, and the endeavour to make a consistent historical picture on the basis of the Chronicler's account, in-

creases in difficulty with every fresh detail which comes into view. The objections to the historicity of the decree of Cyrus have already been noticed. We may not be willing to assert that the Hebrew historical writers decorated their narratives with imaginary decrees of kings and senates as they decorated them with the imaginary speeches of their heroes.¹ But it is evident that a writer like the Chronicler might, on occasion, give his conception such a form. And the obvious impossibility of the proclamation attributed to Cyrus throws a shadow upon the other documents alleged in this narrative.

The next of these is a list of names—ostensibly a register of those who returned from the Exile. This list is repeated in the book of Nehemiah, and there we discover that it is the register of all the families which in the time of Nehemiah or later, claimed to belong to the district of Jerusalem, on the ground of having been carried into exile, and having returned thence. The most that it can show is the total number of those who had returned between the time of Cyrus and that of Nehemiah—nearly a hundred years. Whether it even shows this is a question. In any case, it has no bearing on the first return for which the author uses it.²

The further narrative of this early period is unintelligible. The alleged letter, by which the enemies of Judah and Benjamin troubled them, and put a stop to the building of the Temple, does not belong in this connexion. The author of the narrative speaks of events in the reign of Xerxes and Artaxerxes, both of

¹ Stade speaks of the "well-known custom of ancient writers" so to do (*Geschichte*, II, p. 122), while Meyer denies the custom (*Entstehung des Judentums*, p. 2). In this general form the discussion is unprofitable, and Willrich may go too far in charging wholesale forgery of decrees on the Jews of a later time (*Judaica*, p. 40 ff.). But for the Judaism of the third and second centuries before Christ, the books of Daniel and Esther furnish sufficient evidence.

² Compare Ezra, 2 and Neh. 7²⁻¹³. The extent of the agreement is shown by Meyer, *Entsteh. des Judentums*, p. 141 ff. He also shows that the most of the names occur among those who signed the covenant (Neh. 10). A number of them are found also among those who are said to have returned with Ezra (Ezra, 8). That the narrative of the return in Ezra, 1, was originally fuller is shown by Torrey in the *Journal of Biblical Literature* (1897), p. 168 f. On the whole question of the composition of the books, see Torrey's *Composition and Historical Value of Ezra-Nehemiah* (Giessen, 1896).

them later than Darius. The complaint to Xerxes is only alluded to, the one to Artaxerxes is reproduced in its Aramaic text. But on reading it we are astonished to find that it speaks not of rebuilding the Temple, but of building the walls of the city. It is evident that these are two very different things, and they must not be confused in our thought. To fortify the walls of the city would be an act of doubtful loyalty. Jerusalem as a fortress had always been difficult to conquer. We may well suppose that its reputation in this respect was known to the Persian king. We should expect a complaint against such a work to be received and heeded at court. But the exiles—or whoever was at work—were rebuilding not the walls, but the Temple, and this was a very different matter. Against this no valid objection could be made. A venerable sanctuary had a claim upon the tolerance and even the favour of the monarch. The letter given in this connexion,¹ which is ostensibly directed against the rebuilding of the Temple, really declares that the returned exiles are rebuilding the walls. Only thus can the writers rouse the fear of the king, lest the city, once fortified, should withhold the taxes.

It must be clear either that the letter thus cited, in answer to which the work was stopped, was a gratuitous libel or that it does not belong in this connexion. If it were a gratuitous libel it ought to have been easy for the Jews to show that it was baseless. In any case the Jews should have shown the decree of Cyrus already in their hands; it is impossible to suppose that they had not received and preserved a copy. The only place in which the letter can have any meaning is in the narrative of the rebuilding of the walls under Nehemiah. This took place under Artaxerxes, and the enemies of Judah and Jerusalem were active enough to make such a letter not improbable. But it cannot belong where the Chronicler has placed it.

The second letter (with its reply) is concerned with the building of the Temple, and it is sent by a royal official whose duty it was to take note of what went on in his province. How much weight we can accord to it in the narrative in which we find it must depend upon the picture we may form from other sources. Fortunately, other sources are within our reach in the books of

¹ Ezra, 4 12 ff.; notice v. 13. The writers here claim to have been settled in Samaria, by the great and noble Asnapper (Ashurbanipal), which does not agree with the mention of Esarhaddon in v. 3.

Haggai and Zechariah.¹ These two prophets took a prominent part in what went on in Jerusalem at this time. Both of them prophesied in the reign of Darius I, who came to the throne in 521 B.C.² The change of ruler was, as so often in the East, the signal for outbreaks in several of the provinces. It is not unlikely that the Jews saw in these disorders signs of the approach of their deliverance.³ For some reason the prophets felt that the time to rebuild the Temple had come; the people, on the other hand, felt that the Messianic time must first be manifest, then the Temple would be rebuilt. In the second year of Darius "came the word of Yahweh by the hand of Haggai the prophet, saying: Say to Zerubbabel ben Shealtiel, the pasha of Judah and to Joshua ben Jozadak the chief priest, saying: Thus says Yahweh Sabaoth: This people say the time has not yet come to build the House of Yahweh. . . . Is it a time for you to dwell in your panelled houses, while this House lies in ruins? . . . Thus says Yahweh: Go to the hill country and fetch timber, and build this House, and I will take pleasure in it and will reveal my glory, says Yahweh." ⁴ To whom were these words addressed? The traditional answer is that they were addressed to the returned exiles. It is pleaded on their behalf that they found so much to do in establishing themselves in their new surroundings that they were compelled to neglect the Temple. But this is strange. The exiles had returned (according to the account in Ezra) for the express purpose of rebuilding the Temple. For this they were armed with the decree of Cyrus, and for this they had received free-will offerings from their fellow-exiles and a valuable set of vessels from Cyrus.⁵ Why they should have left everything undone for fifteen years is inexplicable.

¹ The first section of Zechariah (1-8) alone comes into view here. The rest of the book confessedly belongs in a later period.

² The reader may remind himself that Cyrus was succeeded by Cambyses, who carried the Persian arms into Egypt. After him came Pseudo-Smerdis. This impostor was slain by a band of nobles who put Darius Hystaspes on the throne. Cf. Justi, *Geschichte des Alten Persiens*, pp. 48-67.

³ This is denied by so good an authority as Wellhausen, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, V, p. 170.

⁴ Haggai, 1¹⁻⁴, 1¹. A clause has come into the Massoretic text by the error of a scribe and is therefore here omitted.

⁵ If Torrey is correct in filling out the text of Ezra, I, from the Greek Esdras, the original account of the Chronicler also gave a large yearly subvention in money for the building; cf. *Journal of Bib. Lit.* 1897, p. 170; and

We have already seen that the alleged letter to Artaxerxes explains nothing, though the Chronicler put it into his narrative for the purpose of explaining something. Haggai, at least, knows nothing of any earlier attempt, of any subvention, of any decree of Cyrus, of any hindrance on the part of the Samaritan colonists. Haggai is moving the people to rebuild the Temple. Why does he not remind them that this was the purpose of the return? Why does he not recall the earlier attempt as an illustration of their zeal? Why does he not remind them that they had experienced the pain of being banished from this sacred spot? One would think that such arguments would be ready to his hand and that in addition he would emphasise God's gracious purpose in bringing them back, as well as His use of Cyrus as an instrument. But these arguments are conspicuous by their absence.

Haggai knows nothing of a return of the exiles—this is the fact for which we must account. To account for it we must get rid of the Chronicler's theory that all Judah had been carried away and that its land had been left empty. It is evident that this writer knows of only two parties in the land of Israel—those who had been in exile and the Samaritan colonists. In this he is mistaken. No country is ever completely denuded of its inhabitants. Judah certainly was not thus denuded, for the Hebrew records themselves say that Nebuchadrezzar left enough people to care for the vineyards and plantations. That these were not always of the lowest class of the people is made evident by the book of Jeremiah and the history of Gedaliah there given. Whoever and whatever these people were, they felt themselves to be true Judaïtes. Ezekiel, in fact, finds that they attached too much importance to themselves as the only true Israel. They claimed that if Abraham, who was only one man, received the land of promise, much more might they, who were many, hope to make their title clear.¹

In the seventy years that had elapsed since the fall of Jerusalem this community had enjoyed peace under Babylonian and Persian governors. They had been allowed to maintain some of their ancestral institutions and had preserved the ancestral relig-

the decree of Darius which purports to reaffirm that of Cyrus, expressly stipulates that the expense shall be borne by the royal treasury (Ezra, 6⁴).

¹ Ezekiel, 33²⁴⁻²⁹. The bitterness of the prophet is a foretaste of the exclusiveness which manifested itself in the community organised by Nehemiah.

ion. It is a mark of Persian tolerance that they are now under a governor who is a member of their own royal house. For Zerubbabel was a grandson of Jehoiachin—that unfortunate king of Judah who was carried to Babylon by Nebuchadrezzar. From his name we gather that he was born in Babylonia.¹ By his side we find a priest, Joshua, doubtless of the ancient priestly line. It is likely that worship at the site of the temple had never altogether ceased. Soon after the burning of the building we hear of men coming from Ephraim to make their offerings at the ruined sanctuary.² The sacredness of such a site could not be destroyed by any act of the invading Chaldeans. In accordance with ancient Israelitish custom a rude altar of unhewn stone could be erected on such a site at any time.

All the probabilities point, therefore, to a Judaite community settled at this period in the immediate vicinity of the old capital or even within its fragmentary walls. Time had to some degree healed the ravages made by Nebuchadrezzar's invasion. Equally with their brethren in Babylonia these people looked for the restoration of the old commonwealth. But they had no reason to suppose that there must first be a return of the exiles. This is the community to which our prophets appealed. From their own resources they responded to the appeal. It is likely that the Babylonian Jews still took a keen interest in their old home and sanctuary. The effort to rebuild their Temple would meet with their sympathy. But no move on their part to return home was prompted by Cyrus.

If we had the testimony of Haggai and Zechariah alone therefore we should not dream of a wholesale return such as the Chronicler alleges. Let us turn now to the second letter which he gives us as written from Palestine to Darius.³ According to

¹ Koster doubts the Babylonian birthplace and the Davidic descent (*Widerherstellung Israels*, p. 39 f.), and it is true that Haggai lays no emphasis upon the Davidic descent. Moreover, the genealogy comes from the Chronicler, whose untrustworthiness has been sufficiently commented upon. It still remains probable, however, that the Messianic expectations of Zerubbabel's contemporaries point to his Davidic blood. Of Zerubbabel's predecessor, Sheshbazzar, we know nothing, except that he bears a Babylonian name; cf. Meyer, *Entstehung*, p. 76.

² Jer. 41⁵.

³ The account is Ezra, 5³—6¹⁴. It is clear that if the whole account were stricken out we should have a perfectly good connexion, 5³ being continued directly by 6¹⁵.

the narrative, Tatnai, governor of the Persian province of Syria,¹ with his suite came to Jerusalem and discovered the work going on at the Temple. Inquiring for the authority under which the builders were acting, these men wrote an account to Darius. In this they repeated the allegations made by the Jews concerning the earlier decree of Cyrus and asked for instructions. On reception of the message the king had search made in the treasury at Ecbatana, and the decree of Cyrus was found. Darius therefore renewed the decree of Cyrus, or at least directed the governor to let the Jews proceed with the building, ordering him at the same time to reimburse them from the royal revenues what they had already expended, and from the same source to furnish whatever the priests should require for the services of the House. It is easy to see the inconsistencies of the text with what Haggai and Zechariah reveal. The writer is not even careful to preserve verisimilitude; he makes the petitioners request that search be made for the decree of Cyrus at Babylon, and then relates that it was found at Ecbatana. It is inconceivable that Tatnai should quote without comment the Jews' declaration that it was Yahweh who gave their forefathers into the hand of Nebuchadrezzar. The description of the Temple as sixty cubits high and sixty cubits broad is unintelligible, as is the direction that it should be built with three rows of cut stone and one of timber.² Finally the imprecation of Darius, praying that the God of the Jews would blot out any one who should put out his hand to change the decree or to destroy the House, is entirely out of place in a royal mandate.

It must be clear that this correspondence is simply the logical sequel of the decree of Cyrus and can claim no more authenticity. The author started with the theory (given him by tradition no doubt) that Cyrus had ordered the Temple rebuilt, and that the work had been violently stopped. Finding from the books of Haggai and Zechariah that the rebuilding actually took place in the reign of Darius he was obliged to remove the prohibition by a new decree. No more impulse was needed in order to produce the letter and decree we have been considering. They represent

¹ "Beyond the River" is the name of the province which included the region from the upper Euphrates to the border of Egypt.

² The author was familiar with brick walls bound together with timber, but examples of stone walls thus laid have not yet been found.

what must have taken place had the primary tradition been correct. Whether the Chronicler himself composed the documents or whether he adopted them from another narrative—a midrash of his own school of thought—we are not able to determine and it does not much matter.

For historical purposes we are obliged to recognise first, that the Chronicler is dominated by a tradition which was largely the effect of theological prepossession; secondly, that the prepossession incapacitated him from drawing a reliable picture of events; thirdly, that the decree of Cyrus is impossible; fourthly, that the letter to Artaxerxes is of no use for the period under discussion; lastly, that the theory of a return, of an interruption of the work, of any interference by Darius, is contradicted by Haggai and Zechariah, who were contemporary with the events alleged. To this we may add that the theory of a return was not held by Jewish writers in the postexilic period, except so far as they came under the influence of the Chronicler. Nehemiah in his memoirs, as quoted by the Chronicler himself, is ignorant of any return. Malachi makes not the slightest reference to what must have been fresh in men's minds in his time had it taken place at all. At a still later time the author of the book of Daniel is sure that the exile is not yet at an end. The miraculous intervention of Providence, for which the majority of the exiles waited, never came. And the longer they waited the more firmly they found themselves rooted in their adopted country.

Though the people to whom Haggai preached were dwelling in panelled houses, they complained of their poverty. They had suffered from drought and bad harvests. Their poverty did not come (so far as we can learn) from the fact that they were bringing under cultivation land that had been for decades neglected. Nor did they now plead anything of the kind; at the word of the prophet they went to work. Possibly the old solid foundation walls of the Temple were still in place. At the beginning of the work, indeed, there were not wanting voices to declare that this house would never be like the old one. Haggai does not hesitate to allow the material inferiority of the present building. But he is firm in his conviction that its real glory will be greater: "For thus says Yahweh Sabaoth: Yet a little while and I shall shake heaven and earth and sea and land; and I will

shake all nations and the treasures of all nations shall come and I will fill this house with riches, says Yahweh Sabaoth.' ' ¹ With such encouragement the work went steadily forward.

The people, however, were impatient to enjoy those material evidences of Yahweh's favour which the prophet had promised. This comes out in his use of a parable. Haggai is directed to ask the priests two ritual questions. The first is this: If one carry sacrificial flesh in the skirt of his robe and the robe touch bread or wine, will the bread or wine then become sacred? The priests answer in the negative. The other question is whether, if a man unclean (taboo) by contact with a dead body touch bread or wine, the bread or wine will become unclean. The response to this is in the affirmative—illogical as it seems to us. By tradition the contagion of the unclean is stronger than the contagion of that which is consecrated. The familiar law is made use of by the prophet to account for the delay in the promised blessing. The people expected immediate evidence of divine favour in answer to their new zeal. The prophet replied in substance that the contagion of their former indifference had infected them too deeply to be immediately removed. The consecration of the new zeal could not be expected to work at once. But (the intimation is) it will work in time and the change will yet show itself.

At about the same time with this discourse of Haggai, the prophet was reinforced by his colleague, Zechariah. The purport of Zechariah's first message is simply that though the men of former times had passed away—prophets and leaders—yet the word of Yahweh was abiding. That word had fulfilled itself upon the disobedient former generation. Upon that word the people were still depending, but its fulfilment was conditioned upon their obedience. One feels the faint-heartedness of the people who were thus addressed.

The further visions of Zechariah make us realise the great

¹ Hag. 2 ^{6f}. It can scarcely be accidental that the account describes the people as the *remnant* of the people, or as all the *people of the land*. This language flatly contradicts the theory of the Chronicler. It is perhaps superfluous to insist on this. But one may be allowed to notice the significant concession of Meyer (*Entstehung des Judentums*, p. 167) that the chiefs of the districts belonged to the clans which had not been carried into exile, but which had possession of the land when the Jews returned under Cyrus.

change which has taken place in the believers' theory of the universe since the time of Jeremiah. Yahweh now has His throne in heaven, and His administration has been elaborated much after the fashion of the Persian court. He has His servants who go about to do His bidding. Some of these are interested in the welfare of Judah, and the prophet is permitted to overhear their conversation. He sees the heavenly post-riders, who bring news of the state of things throughout the earth. He hears them report: "We have gone over the earth, and all is quiet and secure." Then he hears the angel of Yahweh¹ ask his king: "How long wilt Thou not pity Jerusalem and the cities of Judah, with which Thou hast been angry these seventy years?" We see that the prophet had been longing to hear of those overturnings of the nations which should herald the promised Day of Yahweh. If, as has already been suggested, the disorders which arose at the accession of Darius were the occasion of the prophet's first activity, these disorders must have been speedily quelled, or else must have been confined to distant regions. We cannot otherwise account for the message before us.² The *seventy years* of Yahweh's anger are the seventy years of Jeremiah's prophecy. The angel of the vision is troubled (as is the prophet) by the fact that no signs of Yahweh's grace are seen, though the period of punishment has passed.³ But the expostulating angel is comforted, and the prophet is bidden to say that Yahweh's anger is now turned against the nations which He employed to execute His decrees upon Jerusalem. For in carrying out these decrees they have gone far beyond their instructions and His intentions. Now He is about to have compassion on Jerusalem, and His House is to be rebuilt. We are reminded by this again of the organisation of the Persian empire, where a powerful satrap might easily evade or exceed the commands of the sovereign, and not be detected unless the sovereign's personal attention were called to the matter. This vision is followed by another which shows the workmen ready

¹ That is, the particular angel who had brought revelations to Israel in times past, and who is, therefore, specially interested in the fortunes of this people.

² Zech. i 12. Meyer says: "Syria was not affected by the rebellions of 521-519 B.C." *Entstehung*, p. 82.

³ The mention of this period of time seems definitely to locate the vision in the reign of Darius I instead of in the reign of a later Darius, as has been advocated by some critics.

with their tools to dehorn the nations which have oppressed Israel. Yahweh is, in fact, ready to take His journey to His ancient dwelling, the Temple.¹

It could hardly be that the zeal of the people should be aroused for the work of rebuilding, without Messianic hopes and expectations being also quickened. We are not much surprised, therefore, to find the prophets urging the people not only to rebuild the Temple, but also to take direct steps toward the realisation of the Kingdom of God. Of course, rebellion against the Persian power was not to be thought of—though independence was the goal toward which the people must be moving even when not avowing it to themselves. For the present, internal affairs might be arranged in accordance with Ezekiel's programme of complete consecration. The first and most obvious thing to do was to make the priesthood independent of the secular power. This we may suppose to be one interest of what we may call the Messianic party. Others there were who looked on any innovation with suspicion. They found reason to complain of Joshua, the chief priest. They thought him already too powerful, or too conspicuous in the community. Possibly they found fault with his personal character. Zechariah is altogether on his side, and makes a defence of him in a dramatic vision. In this vision he sees the heavenly court of justice in session, with Yahweh in the character of presiding judge. The official prosecutor is present in the person of Satan, who here appears for the first time in Hebrew literature. He is obviously not the spirit of evil who appears in later Jewish writings; he is only an officer of justice, whose business it is to see that the case against criminals is properly presented.² Before this court Joshua is brought, clothed in the miserable apparel which an accused person puts on to move the mercy of the

¹ Zech. 1⁷–2⁵. The exhortation to flee from Babylon, which is found a little later (2¹¹), is another indication that no return had yet taken place; cf. also 6¹⁵, 8^{1, 8}. The desperate attempt of Sellin, *Studien zur Entstehungsgesch. der Jüd. Gemeinde*, II, p. 45 ff., to harmonise Haggai and Zechariah with the received view, is the best evidence that reconciliation is impossible. I have not seen Hoonacker's argument, a considerable part of which is adopted by Sellin.

² Satan is, therefore, in this period a good angel, carrying out the will of Yahweh. In the book of Job he is virtually the same—more distinctly the inspector of morals, perhaps. Babylonian precedents are given by Zimmern in *Keilinschr. und Altes Testament*,³ p. 463.

court. As the matter is presented to us, we hear nothing of the charges, but the sentence which is pronounced is in Joshua's favour. Satan is rebuked, Joshua is clothed in seemly garments with the tiara on his head, and he is given jurisdiction over the house and court of Yahweh. The meaning is that the new prominence of the high priest (as we may call him), has the endorsement of the prophet.¹ And this prominence is authorised as one feature of the Messianic time, for in immediate connexion with it comes a specific promise of the Branch—a name for the Messiah possibly as old as Jeremiah. Joshua is described as a sign that the Messiah is to come in the immediate future. In fact, in Zechariah's view the man is already in Jerusalem, though not yet crowned.² In a later discourse he is described as the one who is to build the Temple of Yahweh.

Careful examination of these passages leaves no doubt that Zechariah identified Zerubbabel with the expected Messiah. The beginning of the Temple was, in his mind, the harbinger of the restoration of Israel under the ideal king. Zerubbabel was to carry that work to completion and then be crowned, after which he and Joshua were jointly to administer the government. As if to leave no doubt in our minds, the prophet finds new occasion to certify his belief. Some of the exiles, we learn, having heard of the project of rebuilding the Temple, have sent a delegation with votive offerings for the sanctuary. These men are sojourning in Jerusalem, and Zechariah is commanded to take the gold and silver they have brought and make of it a crown. The crown is indeed to be kept in the Temple as a memorial of the givers. But it is to be none the less a sign of the kingship of Zerubbabel.³ With this agrees the promise of Haggai to Zerubbabel: "I will take thee, Zerubbabel, my servant, and

¹ Zech. 3⁶. The description of Joshua as a *branch plucked from the burning* (v. 2) has been urged as evidence that Joshua had been in exile. But the phrase is equally appropriate (even more so) if he was a member of the *remnant* community that had not been carried away.

² Zech. 3⁸. The word *Branch* as designation of the Messiah is found in Jer. 23⁵ and 33¹⁵. Both passages are of doubtful authenticity, as is Isaiah 11¹, a passage similar in meaning though not using the same word. Zechariah's meaning is unmistakable; cf. 6¹².

³ The present text (Zech. 6¹¹) puts the crown on the head of Joshua, but this is an alteration of the original sense, as is evident from the whole context.

will make thee like a seal ring, for thee have I chosen, says Yahweh." ¹

The various visions in which Zechariah sets forth the coming golden age may be briefly noticed. He expects the divine administration to purge the community of the sinners, whose presence is an offence to Yahweh, by an act of supernatural efficacy. Thus we must interpret the flying roll written over with curses, which goes about and destroys the evil-doers together with their houses. The conscience of the people is doubtless burdened (as in the time of Ezekiel) by the thought of the guilt inherited from the fathers. To relieve them, the prophet pictures the guilt in the form of a woman who is shut up in a cask, and carried away by two winged creatures to the land of Babylonia—a materialistic expression of the thought that Yahweh's wrath will no longer find its object in Judah, but in the land of the oppressor.²

That the Messianic time has dawned and that the full glory of its day is soon to appear is the absorbing thought of Zechariah. That its benefits will not be confined to Judah is indicated when the prophet declares that many nations will join themselves to Yahweh in that day and will become His people; and again that ten men of various nations will attach themselves to each Jew in order to find the true God. This thought, with which Zechariah closed his book, is more eloquently expressed in a passage now imbedded in the works of older prophets, but which may belong in this period: "It shall come to pass in the latter days that the Temple Mount shall be established as the highest of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall stream to it, and many peoples shall set forth and say: Come, let us go up to the Mount of Yahweh, to the House of the God of Jacob."³

The vitality of the Messianic hope is evidenced by the fact

¹ Hag. 2²⁴ The rejection of Jehoiachin is described as the plucking the seal ring from Yahweh's right hand (Jer. 22²⁴), and the election of Zerubbabel to the kingship could not be better set forth than by the language of Haggai. It is indeed probable that Haggai has Jeremiah's metaphor in mind.

² The two visions are contained in Zech. 5. Chapter 4 gives the vision of the two olive trees, and is designed to assure Zerubbabel of divine support.

³ Compare Zech. 8²⁰⁻²³ with Isaiah, 2²⁻⁵, Mic. 4¹⁻⁴. The latter passage, deservedly beloved, must be a late insertion in the text of the two prophetic books—as is now generally recognised.

that it survived the disappointment which must have come upon its cherishers at the close of this period. The impetus which was given by the prophetic exhortations was sufficient to secure the completion of the Temple (in some form) in the sixth year of Darius.¹ But with this date thick darkness falls upon the little community in Jerusalem and its immediate vicinity. It may be that the extravagant expectations which attached themselves to Zerubbabel made him obnoxious to the Persian court. It may be that an attempt was made by him to rebuild the city walls, and that this produced a crisis from which the city emerged again in ruins.² More probably, however, the little commonwealth suffered only from the accidents of its position. Evidence of the special presence of Yahweh there was none. The city was imperfectly fortified, and in times when the central government was careless it must have suffered from the raids of the Bedawin. The Edomites were pushing up from the south—small blame to them, for the Nabateans were crowding on them in the rear.

To the momentary enthusiasm aroused by the prophets, therefore, succeeded a period of depression. The brethren in Babylonia may have had a sentimental interest in the restored Temple and we may suppose that they sent occasional contributions to it. But like the Jews of later ages they were probably willing to stay where they found themselves well off rather than give up a certainty for an uncertain livelihood. The people in Judah were heavily taxed. The new government—high-priest alongside of pasha—can hardly have been without its disadvantages. Even Zechariah had some suspicion that the two rulers might not always agree.³ In a small community facing the problems of poverty, party feeling is sure to run high. The Persian govern-

¹ The date is given by Meyer as April 9, 515 B.C. (*Entstehung des Judentums*, p. 54).

² Ingenious attempts to write a history of Zerubbabel's rise and fall have been made, of which the most elaborate is Sellin's *Serubbabel* (1898). His arguments are more acute than convincing, resting on precarious theories concerning the date of the documents. The author now admits that he was mistaken in some of his conclusions—cf. his *Studien zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Jüdischen Gemeinde*, I (1901), pp. 230-238.

³ As pointed out by Wellhausen on Zech. 6¹³. If "one bad general is better than two good ones," the certainty of the dual control working badly in any time of stress may be assumed.

ment removed Zerubbabel—at least we hear no more of a Davidic pasha. We have pretty good evidence that the Temple fell into decay and that its services were an object of contempt on the part of the majority of the people. Doubtless the priests were unable to support themselves¹ except by menial occupations which kept them away from the sanctuary or interfered with the decent observance of the rites.

The state of things in the Jerusalem of this period is vividly put before us by the little book of Malachi—a voice and nothing more—deploring evils which were felt by a few spiritually minded men who held fast their hope in circumstances that prompted to despair.² The prophet begins by encouraging his people in the face of the Edomite invasion, giving them the assurance that though Esau was Jacob's brother, he was hated by Yahweh in proportion as Jacob was loved. The author's main purpose, however, is to rebuke the laxity and faint-heartedness of both priests and people. In the circumstances that we have surmised we can hardly wonder that the priests have become indifferent to the honour of their God. They bring maimed and sick animals to the altar and say: *It is no harm.*³ The prophet points out the indignity thereby offered to Yahweh. If they were to make such presents to the civil ruler they would be taught a lesson: "Bring it to the Pasha; will he look favourably upon you?" The indignity is the more striking because it is in contrast with the conduct of the Gentiles. They know how to render acceptable homage to the one true God: "From the rising of the sun to its going down, my name is great among the nations. Everywhere pure offerings are brought to my name because my name is great among the nations; but *you* keep on profaning it in that

¹ The demand that the ministers of religion should be enabled to live a *menschenwürdiges Dasein* seems reasonable in the interest of religion itself.

² The book is really anonymous, *Malachi* (my messenger) being only a conjecture of the editors. Perhaps the disrepute into which the prophets fell after the non-fulfilment of the hopes fostered by Haggai and Zechariah, led the author to conceal his identity. The text of the book has been helpfully treated by Torrey in the *Journal of Bib. Lit.* for 1898, pp. 1-15. On the Edomite possession of Judah, see an article by the same author, *ibid.*, p. 16 ff.

³ Is it a case where the priests substitute inferior animals for those actually presented by the worshippers? It would seem to be to the interest of the priests themselves to refuse unfit offerings. But by substitution they might profit themselves.

you say: The table of Yahweh is contemptible.'"¹ The plain teaching of the passage is that the most worthy worship of the Gentiles is really offered to the true God.

And yet the foreign cults which are making their way into the Jewish community are not a manifestation of true religion—probably we should feel the same way about the petty superstitions of the Syrian peasants. These superstitions are attracting the wayward hearts of the Jews, so that the covenant with Yahweh is likely to be forgotten.² The danger of such defection was less threatening, however, than that which arose from the general scepticism of the people. They said that good and evil were both alike to Yahweh; it was impossible to call Him a God of justice. The only reply that our author can make is to repeat the promise of former prophets—there will be a sudden revelation of that justice, a Day of Yahweh. But as with the former prophets this Day is not necessarily a day of good to Israel, so now we hear: "Who may endure the day of His coming, and who can stand firm when He shall appear? For He is like the refiner's fire and like the fuller's alkali. . . . I will draw near you *for judgment*, and I will be a swift witness against the sorcerers and the adulterers and the perjurers and against those who oppress the hireling, the widow, and the fatherless, and against those who abuse the client and who do not fear Me, says Yahweh Sabaoth."³ So we hear again the old prophetic demand for righteousness between man and man. The conscience of the ritualist has not been blunted by his scrupulousness in matters of external service—though this scrupulousness would not have been intelligible to the older prophets.

Although the prophet rebukes the priests for their neglect of the services, he recognises the fact that it is the people's treatment of the priests which is at the bottom of the evil. The Temple service cannot be worthily maintained unless the contributions

¹ Mal. 1². The universalism of the declaration is one of the most remarkable things in the Old Testament. But it does not seem possible to understand the passage in any other way than it is taken above. The universalism is the more remarkable because of the author's ritualistic tendencies.

² This seems to be the only way to understand the passage, Mal. 2¹⁰⁻¹⁶. The other view, which makes it refer to intermarriage with foreigners, presents serious difficulties; see the discussion of the passage in Wellhausen's *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, V.

³ Mal. 3²⁻⁶.

are regularly made. The people seem to have withheld the tithes on the plea that the harvests are bad. Malachi holds, with the earlier prophets, that fidelity to Yahweh will make the harvests good. And fidelity to Yahweh will be manifested by bringing the tithes and first-fruits. So we find a specific promise that if the tithes and offerings are brought in full measure, the rains will be abundant and the harvests bountiful.¹ Even with prompt payment, however, it is not certain that the tithes will be sufficient to support the priests. At least, the ecclesiastical taxes were made heavier at a later time.

The period, then, was one of great depression. The faith of the great body of the people had grown cold. The most significant fact is the existence of a little group of faithful spirits who will not yield to the prevailing scepticism. They are constant in their observance of the ancestral Law—though even they are not certain of seeing any reward. They confess that they felicitate the bold blasphemers who have tested the ways of God and who find themselves none the worse for their wickedness.² The answer of the prophets to this temptation was the assurance that the day burning as an oven would soon come when they should tread the unrighteous under foot. They were to wait long for that day and die without the sight. Unknown to themselves, perhaps, the mainspring of their action was the conviction that it must be better to serve Yahweh even in adversity than to dwell in the tents of wickedness. Something of this kind was in the prophet's mind when he gave them this word of comfort: "Yahweh has attended and heard, and a memorandum has been written down before Him for those who fear Him and who think on His name. They shall be mine own, says Yahweh Sabaoth, in the day when I act, and I will deal gently with them as a man deals with an obedient son." The hope of that day was deferred long enough to make the heart sick, but the thought of the book of remembrance stayed up the sinking spirit. If one is not forgotten of his God, he may rest content.

The continued existence of this little band of kindred spirits—an

¹ Mal. 3⁸⁻¹⁰. The contrast to Amos's scornful treatment of the tithes (Amos, 4⁴) will occur to everyone. Malachi, it may be remarked, shows no acquaintance with the Priest-code. The tithes he has in mind are those commanded in Deuteronomy.

² Mal. 3¹³⁻¹⁵; cf. vv. 16, 19.

Israel within Israel—is the most important fact which this period has to show. The future of religion lay in their keeping. The faith and hope they kept alive were based on a true experience of the divine presence. The traditions of the fathers were no doubt cherished among them, and for the most part they rested in the thought that though the day of judgment for the wicked was postponed, it must come in external and visible form. But from this circle one arose to protest against the whole doctrine of the divine administration of the world as it had been formulated by the fathers. Too clear-eyed to rest in delusive hopes, he looked at things as they are, and put on record the struggles and doubts which many were passing through, but were not able to voice. The book of Job was the result, one of the great works of the human spirit. Such a work could be the product only of a period of doubt and depression, and our reason for dating it at this time is that it emphasises the problems which became acute in this period.

What was said in our discussion of Ezekiel shows how the question of the divine justice was forced upon the people by the experiences of the exile. How Yahweh could punish His people and yet not inflict undeserved suffering upon some individuals who were faithful to Him was a problem as difficult as it was painful. Ezekiel cut the knot by the strictness of his logic. With the energy of a determined spirit he drew the necessary inference from his doctrine of the divine nature. Yahweh is just; therefore He punishes or rewards men according to their deserts—the man that sins shall die, the man that does righteously shall live. Such is the simple syllogism which he spins out to so great a length that we see he is bound to convince himself by the iteration. As the prophet had not learned to extend the sphere of the divine justice beyond the present life, the declaration means that the wicked are punished by early or painful physical death, while the righteous live out the years normal to humanity. The simplicity of the theory commends it to intense but narrow natures. Such might hold it fast—by main strength of will and by shutting their eyes to daily experience. But the more reflective minds could not be blind to its difficulties. Especially were the experiences of the century that had passed since Ezekiel calculated to shake their faith. Does the theory accord with the facts? As this question forced itself to the front, and as the facts

were more closely interrogated, it became impossible to make the facts and the theory agree.

The conclusion being invalidated, the premisses also are shaken. We must then give up the belief that Yahweh is just—this is the dreadful thought which presented itself to the inquirer. And if he shrank from this, the problem returned to torment him again and again. Israel was not altogether sinful; why had it been so long scourged by the Gentiles? The Gentiles were not more righteous; why should they be allowed to rage without hindrance? The remnant of Judah, whether in Babylon or in Canaan, had turned to Yahweh with all their heart—some souls among them at least dealt justly and loved mercy and walked humbly with their God. Why should these still be the prey of the oppressor?

Writing with his heart's blood, the author of the book of Job debates rather than answers questions like these. He puts the problem in concrete form, but takes care to divest it of all ritual complications. It is not a question of Israel's prerogatives or of special divine revelation. It is a question of our common humanity—does God the Creator deal with His creatures on any principle that we can understand? The question is stated in the narrative of Job, a man upright and God-fearing according to the patriarchal standard. The story had apparently been known before. Ezekiel, at any rate, names Job¹ as one of three men distinguished for their righteousness, probably all of them also examples of deliverance in calamity. This is hardly the Job of our book, who is famous quite as much for his misfortunes as for his righteousness. It is in fact the combination of the misfortunes and the righteousness that makes the tragedy.

The hero of the book, a perfect example of human virtue, is a hero of tragedy. After seeming to prove by his prosperity that the lot of man accords with the traditional theory—the righteous are prospered—he is suddenly plunged into the deepest affliction. His property is swept away in an hour, and in the same hour his children are cut down in the flower of youth. He himself is afflicted with a loathsome disease whose nature leaves him no hope of life, unless a lingering death extending into years of

¹ Ezek. 14^{14, 19}. It is noticeable that Ezekiel uses the three men to support his theory of strict individual justice—by their personal righteousness they should deliver themselves but no one else, not even son or daughter.

torture may be called life. This is the presentation of the problem.

In the treatment of the problem three separate views seem to be embodied—another instance of the composite nature of Hebrew literature. Popular tradition, which is the source of the story,¹ could not be content without poetic justice. Therefore we find the epilogue restoring Job to health and wealth, giving him another family and extending his life to patriarchal length. It is evident that if this be the author's mind we have no problem. A brief time of privation and suffering would be a trifle when balanced against an additional century of health and prosperity. It is only when the fact of suffering becomes the leading fact, and when reasonable hope of restoration is taken away, that the problem becomes acute.

We must suppose therefore that the epilogue is added or retained in deference to a tradition which already recounted the restoration of the sufferer. It is not inconsistent with this that the prologue indicates a partial solution of the problem. The question is: Why does God afflict the righteous? One answer is given by the new angelology which we found coming into view in Zechariah. In that book we saw Joshua arraigned before the heavenly court with Satan as prosecutor; so here we see the same court convened, but as a court of inquiry rather than as a court for trial. The angels appear in the Presence to report on the condition of the universe. Among them appears the prosecutor, whose business is now that of a detective. To the question whether he has observed Job, the upright, he replies with an insinuation: Job's outward integrity cannot be denied, but it is not difficult to suppose that it is a matter of selfish calculation. When Yahweh rewards virtue with prosperity, mere selfish motives are enough to produce virtuous conduct. To Satan's declaration that if Job should lose his property, his piety will go also, Yahweh replies by giving him permission to make the experiment. The test is applied and Job's disinterestedness is triumphantly established against this charge. But Satan takes his inquisitorial office seriously. He has a second count to bring against the righteous man. Piety may be dictated by fear as well

¹ This is most distinctly brought out by Duhm in his commentary (*Kurzer Handkommentar*). The theory is discussed at length by K. Kautzsch, *Das Sogenannte Volksbuch von Hiob* (1900).

as by desire. Job has been overawed by the power of God displayed in the calamities that have overtaken him. He now cringes before the hand that has smitten, fearing that it will be lifted for a final stroke. But (it is added) if the hope of life is taken away then the true state of his mind will appear—he will be seen not to be righteous but to be depraved, and he will blaspheme his Maker to His face. This test also is applied; Job is smitten with leprosy in its most malignant form so that he must despair of life and has nothing to fear or to hope from Yahweh. He stands the test and holds fast his integrity.

In the behaviour of Job under affliction we have undoubtedly one answer to our problem. The writer comforts himself with the thought that if we could see all that goes on in the divine council we should see a reason for much that is now obscure to us in the government of the world. Among the spiritual existences there, as among men here, there may be doubt as to the reality of virtue—at least of human virtue. To prove that virtue is more than selfishness there is no way except to send calamity upon the virtuous. It concerns mankind and angels to be convinced that there is such a thing as disinterested goodness. This we may call a real solution of the problem.

But it is far from satisfying the author of the poem. He seems, in fact, to ignore the solution, for the poetical part of the book makes no reference to Satan or to the desirability of testing virtue by calamity. The author's eye is fixed upon the sufferer who is ignorant that he is being experimented upon in the interest of truth. The struggles of the soul under the knife absorb the writer's attention. The tragedy is unfolded, as we see this soul wrestling with the thought that, though innocent, it has lost its God. In the dialogue this soul (which is the reflection of the writer's own soul) reveals itself to us—its deepest experiences, its yearnings and gropings, its passionate rejection of the popular theology. The interlocutors are Job and his three friends. These men, representatives of tradition and philosophy, come ostensibly to condole with him on his misfortunes. But their silence is eloquent of something very different from sympathy. It shows that in their secret thought they are pronouncing judgment upon the sufferer. As in former times Job had concluded from a man's calamity that he had by sin incurred the just displeasure of God, so these uncomfoting comforters are attributing to Job himself

wickedness and hypocrisy, colossal in proportion to the greatness of his calamity.

It is impossible for us, of a more advanced type of thought, to realise the depth of the misery into which the sufferer is thus plunged and which causes him to break out into curses against the day of his birth. It is not that he values the judgment of his friends; it is because their theory has been his own. His life's faith is suddenly shown to be untenable. Where he had thought he could stay himself on God he found a void beneath his feet and felt himself falling into a bottomless abyss. While he was in prosperity it had been easy for him to believe that God is just and is a rewarder of His servants. *Now* that faith is gone.

It is gone just because his conscience is clear. He knows with the certainty of inner conviction that he is not the flagrant sinner who alone could call down such signal punishment. As to the opposite conviction of the friends there can be no doubt, though they try to be considerate in their statements. So far as their convictions will allow they desire to spare their friend. But they have no doubt that this suffering is a punishment for sin. They show the grounds for their belief in the traditions of the ancients confirmed by their own observation. They claim to have been taught by divine revelation concerning the divine method of dealing with men. With phrases of studied mildness they invite Job now to repent of his sin, and they even promise restoration to health and prosperity in case he follows this advice.

The terrible mockery of such promises to a man in his condition only increases the perplexity and the despair of the sufferer, further aggravated as the friends proceed to make direct charges of sin against him. Turning about everywhither, he finds no hope. The best that he can wish for is annihilation. He accuses his friends of failing him at the time when he most needs them. He describes his sufferings, bodily and mental. At last in desperation, with what seems to them effrontery, he expostulates with God. Why should he, an insignificant creature, be watched as though he were the rebellious ocean or the primeval dragon that threatened to undo the work of creation? Would it not be more worthy of God to forgive human failings, seeing that the divine dignity cannot be injured by the puny efforts of the creature? ¹

¹ Job, 7 ¹²⁻²¹.

To the friends this is but the raving of a madman, and it confirms them in their theory. To their insistence that God must be just, Job now gives his assent, but in a form which shows that he still denies. He will concede their position if might makes right:

“ Verily I know that it is so : how can man be righteous before God ? If He should choose to bring suit against him, he could not answer one count in a thousand.

The wise in mind and mighty in strength ! Who could oppose Him and come forth whole ?

Before Him who moves mountains without knowing it, and overturns them in His wrath ! ”¹

One does not argue with the master of a hundred legions. But this is no answer to the main question. If the theory of the friends comes only to this, that God is always in the right because He has the power to crush opposition, then there is no debate. But then, too, God is not the God in whom Job has trusted.

This is the anguish of the situation. The God of justice has disappeared and a powerful tyrant alone remains. This (Job thinks) is really what the friends mean. Justice is not what they are looking for. They look only for indications of the tyrant's mood and then manœuvre to keep on His side, for He is the strongest ; just as the sycophants about an absolute monarch are ready to justify his most cruel or most oppressive whims. It still remains true that Job is innocent—this he will protest till his last breath. And he could prove it to God Himself if only they could meet on equal terms, as man meets man in argument. If God would lay aside His terrors, if there were an umpire who would impartially consider the evidence, he would rejoice to defend his case. Even as it is, at the risk of offending his omnipotent adversary he must declare his innocence. He will not lie—even to curry favour with the Almighty. Hence the protest which he addresses to God. The right of the creature must be affirmed even if the affirmation seems to be a defiance of the Creator.²

It is clear that the friends with their stiff dogmatism cannot

¹ Job, 9²⁻⁵.

² Read chapters 10 and 13.

comprehend this state of mind. The words of Job are to them blasphemy, and only strengthen the conviction that he is a monstrous sinner—a hypocrite as well, because he insists that he is righteous. They reaffirm their doctrine with increasing heat, until at last they accuse him to his face of crimes for which there is no evidence outside the exigencies of their theory. More and more distinctly Job sees that there is no relief for him in their way of thinking. Their theology, which has also been his theology, is hopelessly bankrupt. But in proportion as he is driven from his theology he is driven back to God. He has no other refuge, and his heart tells him that there is a refuge here. God must be just—not in the sense in which the friends have declared, but in the sense in which the heart cries out for justice. This does not tell him why he is afflicted; that is a mystery which he cannot solve. But somewhere, somehow, God will disprove the false charges brought against His servant. Long after his death, it may be, God will be his vindicator and will bring the true state of the case to light. With this he will be content.¹

The real solution of the problem is the state of peace attained by the believer through all this struggle. It is not an intellectual solution of the problem; it is the experience of a soul. What the author shows us is a man thrown into the darkness of despair by God's inexplicable dealings with him. He loses his faith for the time being, but he comes through his doubts and finds his God again. In a way this is a justification of God's dealing with Job. But it is the destruction of the popular theology, and it is no solution of the problem of the universe. This the author goes on to prove by the mouth of Job himself. The fact that Job is able to rest upon God does not mean that the friends are right in their interpretation. The popular theology is false in asserting that this world is administered on the scheme

¹ The celebrated passage, Job, 19²³⁻²⁷, is so overlaid with Christian associations that we find difficulty in apprehending its real meaning. The persistence with which, up to this point, Job has denied the reality of reward or punishment beyond the grave makes it certain that he does not suddenly adopt such a theory here. What Job actually says is this: his confidence in God gives assurance that his vindication will come, and that he will be permitted to know it. In the dark regions of Sheol a momentary vision may be vouchsafed him—this is the most that he can hope for, but with this he will be satisfied.

of rewards and punishments. Observation of the facts about us shows not only that the righteous suffer but that the wicked prosper. So far is it from being true that the wicked are snatched away by an untimely death, that we might put it just the other way—the wicked oppressors grow old in power. They grow in power and in wickedness, and when at last they are taken away it is by a painless death. The problem stands out much more boldly than Job had ever thought, until he turned his attention to the facts. And it is insoluble. To the question, “On what principles then is the world governed?” no answer can be given. This is our author’s deliberate conclusion. Yet faith is not altogether taken away from us. As we look at the wonderful works of God in nature we see that perfect wisdom is at work. We can rest in the conclusion that He who is able to carry on such a wonderful scheme of things will also be able to give a reason for His dealings with men. His ways are unsearchable; we may trust that they are true and right nevertheless.¹

It is doubtful whether this treatment of the problem of the divine government was understood by the contemporaries of the author. The book was too profound for the average mind—nor has it been adequately apprehended in any age. The epilogue has probably saved it from perishing by neglect. The author’s answer to the problem of history is one in which the believing mind could not rest. From the same circle of thoughtful minds, and at about the same time, came another answer in the brilliant and devout poem which we now read as the second part of the book of Isaiah.

At the beginning of the exile the suffering of Israel could be accounted for on the ground that the people were punished for their sins. The longer the exile endured the more difficult it was to accept this explanation. Continued suffering would then imply that Israel was much worse than the Gentiles, for Israel was afflicted while they escaped. But this could not be seriously held. The author of the book of Job had abstracted the question from its particular national colouring and discussed it as an ethical question pure and simple, reaching a *non liquet*. The author of the poem which now engages our attention fixed his

¹ That this is the purpose of the chapters (38 and 39) which describe the wonders of nature must be manifest. The speeches of Elihu (32–37) are clearly a later insertion in the book and add nothing to the discussion.

eye on the concrete problem. Israel is personified by him, and is constantly before his mind. He is not content with one form of the figure. He realises that Israel may be represented by the half-rebuilt ruins of Jerusalem, and the still desolate cities of Judah. These he addresses with words of encouragement and comfort—Zion is the forlorn and sorrowing wife of Yahweh mourning the absence of her husband; and she is comforted by the promise of His speedy return. But Israel is also the nation which went into captivity, and which still in large part sojourns in the East. This Israel, in the author's view, has a great mission in the world. It is personified as the Servant of Yahweh, chosen by Him and called to the work of a prophet. This Servant, the most striking ideal figure of the Old Testament, is also comforted and encouraged. He is introduced speaking like a prophet, conscious of his high mission, reciting the word of His God. *Israel the prophet of Yahweh to the nations*—this is the author's solution of the problem of history.¹

More fully than anyone who has preceded him, our author affirms Yahweh to be the only God, the God of the whole earth. With all the ardour of a passionate nature, this is declared again and again. Yahweh is the Creator of the ends of the earth; He makes peace and creates evil; He takes up the isles as a mote; He spreads out the heavens as a canopy; He marshals the constellations in their order, and for fear of Him every star keeps its appointed place in the ranks.² The gods of the nations are, on the other hand, nothing but idols. They are sticks and stones, behind which is no spiritual power of any kind. Scorn and contempt for these manufactured articles breathe in every passage where they are mentioned. The process by

¹ This is not the place to argue the complex critical problems which cluster around the great poem which we call Deutero-Isaiah (Is. 40-66). A whole library has been written on the subject, and the discussion is still going on. The reader will find the main points discussed in the recent commentaries on Isaiah, in the articles of the recent Bible Dictionaries and in various monographs, some of which will be cited below. My own view is that the work is by a single author, though not all written at one time. This author lived some time after the date of Cyrus, and the references to that king in 44 and 45 are later insertions. He lived, however, in the Persian period. The text has suffered some in transmission and must be cleared of some *minori* interpolations. I am indebted to Professor C. C. Torrey for light on some points which were to me obscure.

² Numerous references might be given—note especially chapter 40.

which they come into being is enough to show their nothingness. Of the workmen in the idol shops it is said :

“ One helps the other, and says to his fellow : Be of good courage !
 So the craftsman encourages the goldsmith ; he who smoothes with
 the hammer him who smites the anvil,
 Saying of the soldering : It is good ; and he fastens it with nails.”¹

The absurdity of a god that must be nailed up in order not to topple over is patent ; and so is the folly of the man who takes a piece of timber, makes a fire with one half and shapes the other into an object of worship. Such gods are nothing—a stick of wood is a stick of wood and nothing more. Their nothingness is indicated further by their weakness—they cannot do anything, either good or bad. Yahweh, speaking by the mouth of his prophet, challenges them on this head—let them do something to show their power and men will believe in them. The challenge results in a demonstration of their impotence. And the evidence thus given will be confirmed in the near future by the fate that will overtake them. The crisis is not far away in which Bel and Nebo will be involved in the ruin of their city. In the flight of their worshippers these gods will prove a hindrance rather than a help—loading down the jaded beasts which might more profitably carry something of use for their masters.²

Yahweh is the God of history. He knows the end from the beginning, directs the movements of the nations, works out His plans by means of them. This He shows by the fact that to His prophets He has revealed things to come. The diviners and astrologers, prophets of the false gods we may call them, have no knowledge of the signs of the times. Yahweh's challenge to the other gods turns upon this. They are invited to tell how the former things were foretold, or else to announce what is still in the future. Yahweh by His movements throws all their supposed revelations into confusion.³

¹ Isaiah, 41^{6,7}. The verses have possibly been displaced from their original context ; cf. Cheyne, *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah*, p. 299, and his edition in Haupt, *Sacred Books of the Old Testament*.

² *Ibid.*, 46¹⁻⁴. The contrast between Bel and Nebo who need to be carried and Yahweh who has carried His people from their birth will impress the most careless reader.

³ *Ibid.*, 41²¹⁻²³, and notice the confusion of the Babylonian astrologers in 47¹¹⁻¹⁵.

This God of history is in some peculiar sense the God of Israel. His choice of Israel must be the key to history. As to the fact of the choice we are not left in doubt—it is affirmed again and again; and it is set forth under figures familiar to us from our study of the older prophets, though it is nowhere so tenderly described as here. Yahweh is Israel's husband. Zion is compared to a forsaken wife, who despairs of being received again to the affections which she has forfeited. But she is assured that so far from being forgotten she is in perpetual remembrance—her walls are graven on the palms of His hands. In her little faith, she refuses to believe that the prey can be taken from the oppressor. In answer she is pointed to the incomparable power of her Lord and her Redeemer.¹

The word which we translate *Redeemer* is a favourite word with our author to indicate the closeness of the bond between Yahweh and Israel.² It denotes the *next of kin* upon whom in tribal society all social duties devolve. He is vindicator of justice—when a man is slain the next of kin avenges him. He is helper in misfortune, nourishes in famine, redeems from captivity, takes upon him all the interests of his kinsman. Yahweh is Israel's next of kin, Redeemer, Vindicator, Helper. It follows that there is a coming salvation. Israel's redemption is nigh. His scattered ones will be brought back. Zion will be rebuilt in transcendent beauty. Her sons shall come from far and her daughters be nourished at her side. Yahweh Himself will head the returning train, leading them over the desert as the shepherd leads his flock.

To what purpose then is all the suffering through which Israel has gone? This suffering is (as we have seen) more than was required by the divine justice. The author, in fact, is so bold as to say that Zion has received of Yahweh's hand double for all her sins. It is in answer to this question that our author shows a profound philosophy as well as a living faith. God's choice of Israel is not for Israel's sake alone. The great future that opens out before him is a future for the whole earth. All nations are to receive the blessing of the knowledge of Yahweh, which hitherto has been confined to Israel. Distant peoples shall come to Israel with the conviction: "Only in thee is God, and beside there is

¹ Note especially the beautiful passage, 49¹⁴—50³.

² The Hebrew is *gô'el*, for which we have no good equivalent in English.

none, no Godhead at all." To Him every knee shall bow and every tongue shall swear.¹ This universality of the true religion is the end to be attained by Yahweh's choice of Israel, and Israel's suffering is incident to his mission to the nations. He suffers not only for his own sins, but for the sins of others.

The theory of vicarious suffering is not so remote from ancient thought as it is from the thought of our own day—which, indeed, revolts from it. In a society where the clan is held responsible for the acts of each of its members it must often happen that the innocent suffer for the guilty. In any society the cases are not few where the guilt of one involves many in suffering. The solidarity of the social organism makes this inevitable. And the result is often to bring to view conspicuous instances of suffering on the part of those who are conspicuously innocent. The highest instances of virtue are found where men voluntarily take upon themselves to suffer in order that others may be spared. Thus a Moses offers to be blotted out of the book of God, hoping thereby to secure the forgiveness of his people. So in the discharge of his mission many a prophet had undergone suffering in order to bring his people to a knowledge of the truth.

Israel, now, is a prophet-nation standing to the nations in the same relation as that which exists between the individual prophet and his hearers. This is the reason for Yahweh's choice—the choice is a call to make Him known to all the world. Israel is introduced to us declaring this to be his mission :

" Hearken ye far countries unto me, and listen ye distant peoples,
 Yahweh has called me from the womb, from my mother's lap has He celebrated my name ;
 He made my mouth like a sharp sword, in the shadow of His hand He hid me ;
 He made me a polished shaft, in His quiver He stored me.
 He said to me : Thou art my servant, Israel, in whom I will glorify myself.

.

But now Yahweh says—He who formed me from the womb to be a servant to Him :

¹ Isaiah, 45 ¹⁴, ¹⁵, ²², ²³, and notice the passages to be cited in the immediate sequel.

It is too light a thing to raise up the tribes of Jacob and
to restore the preserved of Israel ;
I set thee as a light of the nations, that my deliverance
may go to the ends of the earth." ¹

And as Israel avows this to be his mission so Yahweh testifies concerning His purposes: "Thou too shalt call nations that thou knowest not and peoples that have not known thee shall run unto thee." ² The substance of Israel's message is indicated where Yahweh contrasts His people with the devotees of the false gods: "You are my witnesses . . . that you may acknowledge and believe me and discern that I am He; before me was no god formed, nor after me shall there be any."

Where this is the work of the Servant it must be that persecution and suffering will follow. The course of history is a conflict between Yahweh and the other gods. The partisans of these will not spare His witness. So Israel realises as he describes his present oppression:

"The Lord Yahweh has given me the speech of the eloquent ;
That I may know how to revive the weary ;
In the morning He wakens my ear that I may hearken as His
disciple
And I have not been rebellious or turned back.
My back I gave to the smiters, and my cheeks to those who
plucked out the beard,
I hid not my face from insult and spitting." ³

But the time is not far distant when the nations themselves will realise that the sufferer has suffered as the result of his faithfulness to his mission, and that therefore it was for their sake. This realisation passes over into the public confession of the vicarious-

¹ *Isaiah*, 49 ¹⁻⁶. I have abbreviated the passage so as to bring out the main thought. The passage is thoroughly discussed by Giesebrecht, *Der Knecht Jahve's* (1902), p. 28 ff.

² *Ibid.*, 55 ⁵. The comparison of Israel to David, whose work was to unite the tribes in a single state, is well explained by Cheyne: "David's appointed work could only be effected by a witness or preacher of the truth, and this witness or preacher was to be (as this prophetic writer knows) the regenerated people of Israel."—*Isaiah* (English translation) in *Sacred Books of the Old Testament*, p. 187.

³ *Ibid.*, 50 ⁴⁻⁶. Compare Yahweh's own description of His servant in 42 ¹⁻⁴ quoted below.

ness of his suffering. In the touching chapter which has been to countless generations a description of the suffering Saviour,¹ the nations are introduced avowing their discovery. That which had not been told them now they see, that which they had not heard they now perceive :

“ Who could believe the report which came to us ?
And to whom was the arm of Yahweh revealed ?

He grew up before us as a sapling ;²
And like a sprout from dry soil.
He had no beauty that we should look upon him,
And no comeliness that we should delight in him.

Despised was he and forsaken of men,
A man of sorrows and acquainted with sickness ;
Like one from whom men hide the face,
Despised, and we esteemed him not.

But it was our sicknesses that he bore
And our sorrows he took upon himself,
While we thought him stricken,
Smitten of God and humiliated.

But he was pierced for our rebellions,
Crushed for our iniquities.
The chastisement that brought us healing was on him,
And recovery came to us through his wounds.

All we like sheep had gone astray,
We had turned every one to his own way,
While Yahweh made to light upon him
The guilt of us all.”³

It cannot be that this self-sacrifice will be unnoticed by Yahweh. There must be a future for this Servant of Yahweh—he shall see a seed, he shall prolong his days and the good pleasure of Yahweh shall prosper at his hands. His great mission will be accomplished, so that all nations will see the salvation of God.

¹ Chapter 53. The right to apply the description to Christ comes not from the minute details of prediction, but from the recognition of Him as the true fulfiller of Israel's prophetic mission.

² A sickly spindling plant is what is meant.

³ Isaiah, 53¹⁻⁶. Cf. the discussion in Giesebrecht *Knecht Jahve's*.

And this glorious work presents itself in part as a conquest. The opposing powers will be crushed before the triumphant hero—Yahweh will rouse the mighty one from the East, will give peoples into his power and strike terror into kings.¹ But more in accord with the prophet's ideal is the gentle work of persuasion by which the Word will be commended to all mankind. The messenger of Yahweh is not to strive or cry or make his voice heard in the streets :

“ A bruised reed he will not break
Nor will he quench a dimly burning wick.
Faithfully will he set forth righteousness ;
He will not grow dim nor be crushed
Till he have set righteousness in the earth,
And for his instruction the far countries wait.”²

That the kingdom of God is to be advanced by gentle measures, that present humiliation is the gateway to future exaltation, that the true believer has a mission to comfort the lowly and to bind up the wounds of those who are afflicted—these are the abiding truths of religion which were put into enduring form by our writer.

But the contrast between the ideal and the actual brings a sharp pain to such believers. Firm as the conviction may be that Israel is the chosen Servant of Yahweh destined to this great work, the present reality forces itself upon the attention. In the midst of triumphant promise and even in the exulting exhortation to Zion to rise to her great mission, we find the complaint that the actual Israel falls far short of his calling. Not only is it a people robbed and plundered, it is a people wilfully blind and deaf. They have not sought Yahweh with their whole heart—rather have they burdened Him with their iniquities. Within the community there is a sharp distinction between those who serve God and those who forget Him. The official class (it is the old complaint of the prophets) who ought to be the protectors and watchmen of the people are unfaithful to their duty—

¹ Isaiah, 41¹⁻⁴. That Israel is intended is plain from v.¹⁵, where Israel is promised that he shall be a powerful threshing-sledge to crush down all opposition. As the tradition arose which made Cyrus the foster-father of the restoration, the passage was applied to him, and finally his name was inserted in 44²⁸, 45¹.

² *Ibid.*, 42, 1-4 and cf. 61¹⁻⁴.

dumb dogs that do not protect the flock.¹ As in the picture drawn by Malachi, the righteous are poor, and the victims of rapacious nobles. So we find it again in the time of Nehemiah. The present author finds a consolation in their early death; they are taken away from the wickedness of the time.

And, as we are told also by Malachi, a considerable section of the people is still devoted to idols. The secret cults which flourished in the last days of Jerusalem (Ezekiel is the witness) have vegetated on among the people of the district. It is not the gods of Babylon or newer oriental deities that seduce their allegiance, but they anoint themselves for the Moloch (*Melech*, the king) whom their ancestors identified with Yahweh. They spread a table for Fortune and pour libations to Destiny—ancient divinities of Syria. They tarry in sepulchral chambers and lodge in secret places to perform rites of worship to the deceased, and to receive revelations from them in dreams. The ancient high-places retained something of their sanctity and at one of them (Gerizim possibly) men were planning to build a temple to rival that on Zion. All this arouses the scorn of our prophet and he denounces it in no measured terms.²

Nor was all well even with those who had not erred in this way. The ritualistic tendency to externalism was showing itself among those who were zealous for Yahweh. These were religious after their fashion—they bowed themselves low at the customary fasts, and put on sackcloth and ashes; they mortified themselves, perhaps even to castigation. But our prophet points out that this is not religion. “Is not this the fast that I choose, says Yahweh: To loose the fetters of injustice; to untie the bonds of violence; to set at liberty those who are crushed; to break asunder every yoke? Is it not to break thy bread to the hungry and to bring the homeless into thy house; when thou seest the naked to cover him and not to hide thyself from thine own flesh?”³ And with this spiritual conception of religion

¹ Isaiah, 56⁹. The present tendency to ascribe Isaiah, 56–66 to a Trito-Isaiah is illustrated by Duhm in his commentary, Cheyne in his *Introduction* and in his text (*Sacred Books of the Old Testament*). Cf. also Gressmann, *Ueber die in Jes. 56–66 vorausgesetzten Zeitgeschl. Verhältnisse* (1899), and Littmann, *Ueber die Abfassungszeit des Tritojesaia* (1899).

² Notice 56^{3–12} where the language is in part borrowed from the older prophets; also 65^{1–15}, 66^{1–4}.

³ Isaiah, 58^{6f}. I have followed Cheyne's translation with slight variations

goes a welcome to those outside the family of Israel who wish to join the communion of believers: "As for the strangers who join themselves to Yahweh to serve Him and to love His name, every one that keeps the Sabbath and takes fast hold of my covenant, I will bring them to my sacred mountain and will make them rejoice in my house of prayer; their offerings and their sacrifices shall be accepted on my altar—for my house shall be called a house of prayer for all nations."¹

And so we come back to the vision of the universal reign of Yahweh. But this does not come by the efforts of men. Yahweh Himself must come and redeem His people. He has looked for human instruments but has not found them. Now He will intervene in His own person. The prophet has a vision which has become part of the apocalyptic expectation for later times. In it he sees Yahweh in blood-stained garments marching triumphantly over all who oppose, treading them as the vintner treads the grapes; the day of vengeance is in His heart and the day of redemption has come.² But to do the writer justice we must add to this warlike picture the splendid description of the renewed Jerusalem. In language which the New Testament has adopted and passed on to the ages, the prophet exhorts the renewed and purified Zion to clothe herself like a bride on the wedding day. Instead of being forsaken and desolate, Jerusalem is to become the metropolis of the world. Yahweh will take up His residence in her, and His presence will enable her to dispense with sun and moon. The people are to become all righteous and the reign of God on earth is to begin.³

A close parallel to this vision is found in a passage now appended to the earlier collection of Isaiah's prophecies.⁴ Here we find the bitterness which the postexilic Jewish community felt toward Edom expressed without reserve. The vengeance

¹ Isaiah, 56 ^{6,7}; cf. 66 ²³: "all flesh shall come to worship before me, says Yahweh."

² *Ibid.*, 63 ¹⁻⁶. It does not appear why the redeemer should come *from Edom*, and the text of v. ¹ should probably be corrected with Lagarde and Duhm so as to read: Who is this who comes *in red apparel* with garments stained like the vintner?

³ Chapter 61. The identity of the point of view in these chapters and in chapters 40-55 is evident. It is unnecessary therefore to posit a Trito-Isaiah; but it is necessary to bring the whole composition to the later date.

⁴ Isaiah, 34 and 35.

which Yahweh is about to take upon all nations will find its chief object in Edom: "For Yahweh has a sacrifice in Bozrah, and a great slaughter in the land of Edom." After this day of reprisal for Zion, the land of Edom will become a desert inhabited only by jackals, ostriches, and hyenas. In contrast with this will be the lot of Israel, whose waste lands shall be made to blossom like the rose. To this land of Israel a way will be opened on which the unclean shall not walk:

"No lion shall be there,
No violent beast shall come up thither;
But thereon the redeemed will walk
And Yahweh's freed ones will return.

They will come to Zion with exultation
And with everlasting joy upon their head;
Gladness and joy will overtake them,
Sorrow and sighing will flee away."

The similarity to what has been quoted above will be evident. And the fact most prominent in the thought of both authors is the scattered condition of the people of Yahweh. Their hope for the future is hope of a restoration. Jerusalem is to become the centre to which the sons of Judah will return from the far lands.

The true significance of postexilic Israel is seen in the hopes that it cherished. It was remarked above that the history of the nation would have come to an end at the fall of Jerusalem had it not been for the little band of exiles in Babylon.¹ Since then we have considered the story of the return and have found no evidence that any large number of Babylonian Jews came back to Judah. It might seem, in view of this fact, as though we had overrated the importance of the exiles. But this is not the case. All the evidence goes to show that the moral strength of the people was sustained by the Babylonian Jews. After more than a hundred years of Persian domination there was, indeed, a little community clustered about the Temple on Zion. But they were poor, disheartened, the prey of designing neighbours, and divided among themselves. Even the few who had learned that Yahweh makes His home with the humble and contrite were upheld, more than they realised, by the assurance that Yahweh had a

¹ Above, p. 299.

people in the far East, that He was keeping them separate from the Gentiles, and that in His own time He would bring them back with joy and gladness. In this faith they felt themselves one with those distant brothers. The faith and the sense of unity was kept alive by messages and tokens of affection. Although there had been no general return, we know that as early as the time of Zechariah a few pilgrims had come with offerings of gold and silver for the sanctuary. As the community of Jews in Babylon throve we must suppose that such offerings became more frequent. The whole influence of Ezekiel had been in favour of the Temple. His pupils must have kept alive his ideal of holiness and of devotion to the sacred House. No doubt the situation in Judah was bad enough. Very few of the people there strove after the ideals which the exiles had at heart. Even idolatry had not been overcome—it is one of our traditional errors to suppose that the exile or the people's experience of misfortune crushed it out. But with all her faults, Jerusalem was still the home of the exile's yearning. He would rather let his right hand lose its cunning than forget Jerusalem his chief joy. It is this affection for Jerusalem which gave Judaism its coherence and strength during the centuries when the people were scattered over the face of the earth. And the consciousness that their city was the object of so much affection kept up the courage of the little remnant which lived in Palestine, and enabled them to endure when otherwise (humanly speaking) they must have succumbed.

Whether the moral support would have sufficed to keep the idealism alive for an indefinite period we are not called upon to decide. At this juncture there arose in the East a clear-headed man, who saw that practical measures were called for to strengthen the beloved city and who had the energy to carry out such measures.

CHAPTER XVII

NEHEMIAH AND AFTER

THE interest with which thoughtful Jews in exile followed the fortunes of the mother city is revealed to us in the memoirs of Nehemiah. This man, with the facility and talent which the Jews have always shown, made himself useful in the court of Persia. He held the office of butler to Artaxerxes, whom we suppose to be the second of the name.¹

In the twentieth year of this monarch's reign (B.C. 385), certain Jews who had made a visit to Jerusalem returned to Susa. Possibly they were a delegation sent from the East to report on the actual condition of the city. They reported to Nehemiah *concerning the remnant who were left of the captivity*. The language indicates Nehemiah's view that the people in Judah were the survivors of Nebuchadrezzar's deportation, and not exiles or descendants of exiles.² Their condition is described as forlorn enough—the walls of the city are in ruins, and the people are in humiliation and disgrace, evidently because they are defenceless against the attacks of their lawless neighbours. In distress at what he hears, Nehemiah pours out his soul in confession to God. He sees in the exile a fulfilment of the threats of Deuteronomy, and pleads with God to remember also the promise: "If you keep my commandments and do them, though you be scattered to the end of the heavens yet I will gather you thence

¹ There is as yet no agreement among the historians as to the Artaxerxes of our text. Heretofore he has been supposed to be Artaxerxes I, Longimanus, but the present tendency is to identify him with Artaxerxes II, Mnemon (B.C. 404–361). So Marquart, *Fundamente Israel. und Jüd. Geschichte*, p. 31, and Torrey, *Composition of Ezra-Nehemiah*, p. 65. A sketch of the reign of Artaxerxes II is given by Justi, *Geschichte des Alten Persiens*, pp. 129–137. He was a man of weak character, easily influenced by his family and his dependants.

² Various attempts have been made to explain away the plain sense of the words (Neh. i ²). Their force is overwhelming when we consider that they were written by Nehemiah himself.

and bring you to the place where I chose to make my name dwell." ¹

Nehemiah was a practical man, and it did not take long for him to resolve on action—possibly a long-cherished hope now became a resolve. When a convenient opportunity came he presented his petition to the king. It was nothing less than that the king would send him to the city of the sepulchres of his fathers to rebuild it. The appeal to natural piety in that phrase, "city of the sepulchres of his fathers," touches us at once and we do not wonder that it reached the king's heart. He appointed Nehemiah pasha of Jerusalem, and gave him the customary body-guard.² Whether he was supported at court by a Jewish party does not appear. It is not unlikely that the Jews of the East, who still thought of themselves as the true Israel, were planning a Zionist movement which would revive their depressed nation, and give it a more worthy home in the ancestral territory. In their life among Gentiles, they had learned to lay stress upon purity of blood. What they learned of their compatriots in Palestine showed a regrettable laxity in this respect. Nehemiah may well have been the pioneer of a movement to correct this abuse as well as to give the commonwealth more consistency.

By favour of his monarch Nehemiah was civil governor of the district, and this gave him an advantage which he used to the utmost. Without it he would have failed in his object, for he found himself opposed by a powerful party from the time of his arrival. Recalling what has already been said about the situation in Palestine we can easily understand this. Party lines were already drawn. There was a stricter and there was a laxer view of spiritual (which included temporal) things, and the adherents of one view looked upon the adherents of the other with suspicion. One sect was intent upon religion, the observance of the Law, the Messianic hope. Its members were mostly among the lowly. They were opposed and perhaps derided by the more worldly minded, the wealthy, the nobles, who wished to develop trade

¹ Neh. 1⁹. That the language is the language of Deuteronomy needs no demonstration. It is almost superfluous to point out that the prayer betrays no knowledge of a partial fulfilment of the promise, either under Cyrus or under the lead of Ezra.

² Whether he also received letters to the governors of "Beyond-the-river" with requisitions for timber as is stated in the present text is doubtful; cf. Torrey, *Composition of Ezra-Nehemiah*, p. 36.

and to keep on good terms with their neighbours. Of this party Nehemiah has some knowledge—at least he supposes them to be ill-affected from the start. Their leaders were Sanballat, a Horonite—Sheikh of the town or district of Beth-horon,¹ we may suppose—Geshem an Arabian and Tobiah an Ammonite. All these men were worshippers of Yahweh and had claims to be regarded as Israelite by blood. How Geshem got his name *Arabian* cannot now be made out. Tobiah is called the Ammonite slave. He seems to have been one of those domestic servants who so often in the East have come to the front by force of character or by unscrupulous devotion to their masters' interests. What aroused these men's anger was that one was come "to seek the good of the Sons of Israel"—Nehemiah regards himself as champion of the true Israel. If he were pioneer of a movement to re-establish the exiles in their old home, the power and prestige of these native leaders would be diminished if not destroyed. Hence their opposition, which made itself felt continuously from this time on. It should be remarked that these men seem to have lived on their own domains outside Jerusalem, and a natural reluctance to have the city again overshadow the country may have reinforced their party feeling.

Nehemiah found some officials in the city and they received him with due respect, though at first he was silent concerning the main object of his visit. Three days after his arrival he inspected the walls, riding out at night that he might be undisturbed. Beginning at the Valley Gate (perhaps near the present Jaffa Gate) he turned to the left and followed the line of the wall to the Kedron valley. At this point the débris was so piled up that his riding animal could not go on. He went some distance farther on foot, then retraced his steps to the point from which he started. He does not tell us how complete the destruction was, nor how recent. Various hypotheses have been advanced concerning attacks upon Jerusalem in the Persian period. None of them seem to rest upon reliable evidence. We may suppose that the Chaldeans left considerable portions of the old walls intact. We know that Zechariah discouraged any attempt to rebuild them, on the ground that Jerusalem would be too extensive to be thus enclosed. What Nehemiah saw may have been the result of time and neglect. In

¹ The two Beth-horons are still pointed out, about twelve miles northwest of Jerusalem.

many places the original foundations would doubtless still be in good condition.

Without delay Nehemiah called a council of the people and proposed the rebuilding of the wall, at the same time laying before them his commission from the king. The majority agreed to the proposition, only the three leaders already mentioned opposed the scheme and suspected (or feigned to suspect) plans of rebellion against the Persian government. They were able to effect nothing, for Nehemiah held the king's commission. Moreover, the project was in itself reasonable. Why should a city with a history, the site of a famous sanctuary, the capital of a district, be left exposed to the attacks of the Bedawin? Probably Nehemiah had the right to call for labourers under the king's authority. If we may trust the list which has come down to us, the work was done not alone by the people of Jerusalem but by the people of the Judaite towns of the district.¹ Even without relying upon the list implicitly, we may suppose that it represents the method in which the work went on. Certain villages, or guilds, or powerful families were made responsible for certain sections of the wall, while Nehemiah took the oversight of the whole.

The opposers at first contented themselves with scoffing. Sanballat asked whether the builders would ever be able to finish; Tobiah remarked that the slight structure they were raising would not keep out a fox. The relations of the two parties were such that the sneers were reported at once to Nehemiah, who replied with vigorous curses. The heart of the people was in the work, however, and the wall soon showed the effect, the breaches being filled up, and the line made continuous to half the height intended. When it got so far, and showed signs of becoming an effective protection to the city, more vigorous opposition was planned. The enemies thought of making an attack in force. We can hardly suppose serious warfare contemplated. More likely there was to be only a sudden rush to throw the builders into confusion and in the confusion to throw down some of the new structure.

¹ Unfortunately the detailed list in Neh. 3 shows such distinct marks of the Chronicler's style that we must view its historicity with suspicion (so Torrey, *l. c.*, p. 37 f.). It is, in fact, difficult to see why Nehemiah, in recording the incidents of his own life, should insert a long catalogue like this.

But Nehemiah was equal to every emergency. The enemies' plans were reported to him, probably losing nothing in carrying. In the interest of peace, faint-hearted or lukewarm workers begged their brethren to cease working. But the leader was not to be discouraged. He dropped work only long enough to make his army of labourers an army of soldiers. He mustered them by their natural divisions of clans and armed them with swords, bows, and spears. He had a body-guard who were accustomed to the use of arms. The report of his measures of defence was enough to daunt the enemy, and the main work was resumed with vigour.¹ In order to guard against surprise, however, the workmen kept their weapons at hand, the leaders slept on their arms, a regular watch was set and the body-guard was kept on the alert. Nehemiah himself was on the wall constantly and kept the trumpeter by him so as to rally the whole force to any point where it might become necessary to repel attack.

These measures effectually prevented an attack from without. But a new and threatening complication arose from within. The work on the wall was done largely by the common people, who seem to have responded willingly to the call of the governor. But they worked without pay, and soon exhausted their own slender resources. The oriental peasant is frequently heavily in debt, borrowing money at exorbitant rates to pay his taxes, or to tide him over a bad year. The Jewish cultivators had done this, mortgaging their fields and houses, some of them pledging their children. The season was a bad one, if we may judge by their allusion to the famine. The work on the wall brought things to a crisis. The debts must be paid, the mortgages were about to be foreclosed; the children were in some cases already delivered over to the creditors. We cannot wonder that this seemed a hard return for their meritorious and self-denying work on behalf of their city, or that the complaints soon became loud enough to reach the ears of Nehemiah. The governor was equal to the occasion. He called the nobles together and rebuked them for their oppression of their

¹ The text of Neh. 4^{6f.} is not altogether sound, but the sense may be restored with some probability—the threat of attack is met with a fine show of resistance. It should be noted that the division of chapters in the English Bible differs from that in the Hebrew by six verses: 3³³⁻³⁸ of the Hebrew is 4¹⁻⁶ of the English, and of course 4¹⁻¹⁷ of the Hebrew is 4⁷⁻²³ of the English. I cite according to the Hebrew text.

poorer brethren. He and like-minded men in the distant East (he says) had been accustomed to ransom those of their own blood who had been sold into slavery. Now these oppressors were doing just the contrary—selling their debtors, though Jews like themselves, into slavery to the Gentiles. Nehemiah himself had loaned money and corn to these poor people. This fact gives force to his proposition that the debts should be remitted. Backed by his strong personality the appeal was effectual, the debts were remitted, and under solemn oath the creditors restored the pledges in their hands. The crisis was thus successfully met.¹

The governor takes occasion by this incident to set before us his method of life. He made no use of his right to levy a tax on the people for his own support. The former pashas had exacted forty shekels a day in table allowance, and their retainers had been allowed in oriental fashion to make requisitions for themselves. All this was now stopped. Nehemiah drew upon his private fortune for his personal expenses, and from the same source kept a public table for the nobles and guests. He provided thus regularly for at least a hundred and fifty persons. His body-guard instead of being a burden on the people was made a help, by being put at work upon the wall. All this is told us with a refreshing simplicity: the man was doubtless conscious of his own merits. But then the merits were there, and the limitations of the man do not interfere with our admiration. His generous and decided action must have put fresh life into his discouraged countrymen.²

As the work of the wall went on, the party of opposition continued their activity. At one time they proposed to Nehemiah to come out to one of the villages to a conference. Why they thought he could be induced to confer with them we are not told. Nehemiah suspected a plot to kidnap him or to put him out of the way by violence. The work in which he was engaged required his personal presence and he so informed them. As repeated

¹ Neh. 5 1-13. The *amen* of the people in v. 13 is perhaps an embellishment by the Chronicler. A vivid touch is given the narrative by Nehemiah's shaking out the skirt of his robe to strengthen his imprecation.

² Neh. 5 14-19. The fact that Nehemiah and his servants *did not buy real estate* is counted among the merits. The meaning is probably that he refrained from buying the properties sold under foreclosure. The temptation to speculate in real estate must have been considerable, especially when other buyers would hesitate to bid against the governor.

verbal messages had no effect, they sent him a letter.¹ In this document they charged in so many words that Nehemiah and his party were planning a revolt, which was to place him on the throne. Further, they claimed that he had suborned prophets to proclaim him king in Judah. There may have been colour to the charge to this extent: that light-headed enthusiasts were looking for the advent of the Messiah and were taking no pains to conceal their expectations. So important a move as rebuilding the city walls would almost inevitably stimulate such hopes. Nehemiah's whole conduct acquits him of any part in this fanaticism. In reply to the letter he drily replies that Sanballat is putting forward the figment of his own brain. The conspirators had not yet exhausted their resources. They themselves suborned prophets to give deceitful advice to Nehemiah. This clique affected to be alarmed for Nehemiah's safety, and proposed that he and his friends should take refuge in the Temple—the sanctuary could easily be made into a fortress. The right of asylum rested upon tradition, and may have been the basis upon which they urged their scheme. But to follow the advice would show cowardice or an evil conscience or both. If it had been followed, the entrance into the Temple might be made the basis of a charge that Nehemiah already arrogated regal privileges. But the plot was too transparent and it failed. Nehemiah seems to have been guided by religious principle, holding that a layman had no right to enter the sanctuary.² I have spoken of a clique because several persons were concerned in this plot—a prophetess named Noadiah is named as though she were especially active.

None of these things hindered the work, and the wall was completed in fifty-two days.³ The opposers were astonished and

¹ The letter was without a seal, which would be regarded as insulting. So, in fact, Nehemiah interpreted it. If the senders were intending to conciliate him they would not have offered an insult, and on this account the omission of the seal has been taken to be an intimation that the contents of the letter were public property. It is easier to suppose the senders simply careless about forms.

² Neh. 6¹⁻¹⁴. Commentators have puzzled themselves to explain why Nehemiah should visit Shemaiah who gave this advice. Probably Shemaiah had sent for him, pleading matters of importance and his own (ritual) inability to come to Nehemiah.

³ This is the assertion of our Hebrew text, Neh. 6¹⁵. Josephus gives two years and four months (*Ant.*, XI, 5, 8), which seems more reasonable; and which is defended by Sir Henry Howorth (*Proc. Soc. Bib. Arch.*, XXV,

put to shame. But their activity was not checked, for we learn that the correspondence between them and their adherents in Jerusalem became more frequent. The intimacy is explained by the fact that Tobiah was connected by marriage with leading priestly families. But the correspondence seems to have effected nothing. For the time being, Nehemiah had triumphed. He took measures to secure police protection for the new gates, and (we may suppose) strengthened his party by some sort of organisation. Unfortunately his memoirs break off here, and we are in the dark as to his succeeding history. Our present text tells us that his term of office extended over twelve years. But we can hardly suppose him to have stayed away from the court so long.¹ The account of his second visit is from the hand of the Chronicler and cannot be relied upon.² Whatever the facts, we can see that this work of Nehemiah gave a mighty impulse to the stricter Judaism. The party of the pious who had been depressed was strengthened and encouraged. They began to draw the lines between themselves and their laxer neighbours more sharply. The work of codifying and enriching the Law was taken up afresh. In fact, the period which began with Nehemiah's visit was the formative period for the Judaism which we find dominant in New Testament times.

The rise of Judaism was, of course, a gradual process. The foundations were laid by Ezekiel. But Ezekiel's ideas had not been at once assimilated—probably they were more effective among the Dispersed than in Palestine. Among the Gentiles the policy of religious separatism was essential. In Palestine, as we have seen, it made its way slowly. Nehemiah was one of those positive characters about whom popular parties rally. He was no compromiser, and he made the situation plain to those who were already inclined to regard themselves as the true Israel. From his time the stricter Jews began to regard their adversaries as the "people of the land" against which their earlier lawgivers warned them. The more liberal ideas of Deutero-Isaiah gave way p. 18 f.). But until we know more about Josephus's sources, it seems unsafe to rely upon any statement of his.

¹ Neh. 5¹⁴ claims that for twelve years Nehemiah did not eat the bread of the pasha. But his agreement with the king was for only a limited furlough—two years would be as long as he could be spared from his place.

² Neh. 13 is the work of the Chronicler as is shown by Torrey, *Composition*, p. 44 ff.

before the practical exigency. Emphasis was laid upon purity of blood and upon observance of the Law. In the course of a century or so after Nehemiah the process was complete. Of its details we are ignorant.

We have, however, a tradition which deserves our consideration. It comes from the hand of the Chronicler, and must be received, like all his narrative, as a picture of what he thought must have taken place rather than a picture of what actually did take place. Its hero is Ezra, a priest and scribe—eponym, one might almost say, of the powerful guild which influenced the whole history of Judaism. The story is as follows:¹ After the completion of the Temple, Ezra, a lineal descendant of Aaron and skilful scribe of the Law of Moses, went up to Jerusalem. The Temple having been completed, it was time to reintroduce the observance of the Law. It was in the seventh year of Artaxerxes² that this man went up to Jerusalem with a considerable train of returning exiles. He carried with him a *firman* from Artaxerxes whose tenor is so remarkable that I reproduce it in full:

“Artaxerxes, King of Kings, to Ezra the priest, Scribe of the Law of the God of Heaven: Greeting.

“To proceed: I have made a decree that anyone of the people of Israel or priests or Levites, in my kingdom, who is willing to go to Jerusalem shall go with thee; because thou art sent by the King and his seven Counsellors to hold an inquisition concerning Judah and Jerusalem with the Law of thy God which is in thy hand; and to bring the silver and gold which the King and his Counsellors have offered freely to the God of Israel whose dwelling is in Jerusalem, with all the silver and gold which thou shalt receive in the whole province of Babylon, with the contribution of the people and priests who contribute for the house of their God in Jerusalem. Therefore thou shalt punctually buy with this money oxen, rams, and lambs, meal offerings also and libations belonging thereto, and offer them on the altar of the house of your God which is in Jerusalem. And whatever shall seem good to thee and thy brethren to do with the rest of the silver and gold, so do according to the good pleasure of your God. And the vessels given thee for the service of the house of thy God, deliver before God in Jerusalem. Whatever else is needed

¹ I follow the able analysis of Professor Torrey, *Composition and Historical Value of Ezra-Nehemiah*.

² Doubtless the patron of Nehemiah is the king intended by the narrator.

for the house of thy God, let that be paid from the King's treasury. And the command is given by me, Artaxerxes the King, to all the treasurers of the province [called] *Beyond-the-river* to this effect: All that Ezra the priest, the scribe of the Law of the God of Heaven, shall ask you, let it be done at once—up to a hundred talents of silver, to a hundred cors of wheat, a hundred baths of wine, a hundred baths of oil, and salt in any amount. All the will of the God of Heaven must be diligently performed for the house of the God of Heaven—why should His wrath fall upon the kingdom of the King and his sons? And be it known to you¹ that it is not allowed to lay tax, tribute, or toll on any priest, Levite, singer, doorkeeper, temple-servant, or workman of this sanctuary. And thou, Ezra, according to the wisdom of thy God which is in thy hand, appoint Judges and Justices to judge all the people beyond the river, all such as know the commandments of thy God; and such as do not know you shall instruct. And whoever does not obey the Law of thy God and the law of the King, let strict justice be done upon him—either death or banishment or fine or imprisonment.”²

It would seem superfluous to criticise this document had not its genuineness been strenuously upheld of late years even by some critical scholars.³ Inscriptions of Persian kings in favour of certain temples are brought forward as parallel. These, however, on examination prove to be anything but parallel. In one case the servants of a temple are protected from the requisition of forced labour and the Persian officials are forbidden to annoy them by such requisitions, and this on the specific ground that the divinity had given a truthful oracle to an earlier Persian monarch. In the other case an ancient right of asylum is simply confirmed.⁴ In contrast with these modest advantages consider the enormous powers conferred upon Ezra. He is to proceed to Jerusalem and make inquisition concerning the observance of the

¹ The address here changes from Ezra to the governors and tax-gatherers but without naming them.

² Ezra, 7¹²⁻²⁶.

³ Especially by Meyer, *Entstehung des Judentums*, p. 60 ff., who accounts for the strong Jewish colouring of the decree by supposing it was drawn up by Ezra and his friends at court and submitted to the king, who good-naturedly signed it. Whether a decree in Council would be so lightly disposed of is doubtful. Cf. also Marquart, *Fundamente*, p. 37 f.

⁴ The Gadatas inscription is given by Meyer in his *Entstehung*, p. 19 f.; the Tralles inscription by the same author in his *Forschungen*, II, p. 497.

Law. He is to appoint judges to administer this Law. Such as are not fully acquainted with it are to be instructed in it. According to the wording of the decree this new code is to be enforced throughout the whole of Syria. We may charitably suppose that the author of the decree intended it to apply only to Jewish settlers in Syria. In a royal decree, however, one expects a more precise definition of the persons affected. In addition, the ministers of the Temple, down to the most menial, are to be exempt, not only from forced labour, as in the Gadatas inscription, but from tax, toll, and tribute of any kind. Enormous sums of money are put at Ezra's disposition for the benefit of the Temple.¹ The position of Ezra, in possession of this decree, is comparable only to that of Solomon—with the advantage that Ezra had no foreign wars to fear, the peace being secured by the Persian power. In fact it is difficult to consider seriously the claim that this decree was ever issued. All the objections urged above against the decree of Cyrus apply here with tenfold force.

But let us return to the Chronicler's picture of Ezra and his times. The great scribe is now introduced as writing his own memoirs. He carefully gives the genealogical status of the emigrants who joined his train, to assure us that none but full-blooded Israelites were of the number. His care for the Temple service is shown by the fact that when no Levites appeared, he sent back to Casiphia and succeeded in enlisting over two hundred.² The entire company numbered over seventeen hundred males. A caravan of that size carrying the king's *firman* would hardly be molested on the journey, and it could require no great act of faith to forego the military escort offered by the king.

The narrative goes on to state that the journey was safely made and that after three days, to allow for purification, those who had charge of the treasure delivered it safely at the Temple. Abundant sacrifices were offered and the returned exiles gave the royal mandate to the Persian officials and received the subventions therein indicated. The heads of the clans contributed liberally

¹ Meyer does not find them exaggerated. But a million dollars in silver and two millions in gold will seem to most people a disproportionate amount for the object proposed.

² This includes the *Nethinim* or descendants of the slaves presented to the Temple by the kings of Judah. They are now classified with the Levites, though so different in origin.

to the Temple treasury, the census of "those who came up at the first" was examined, then priests, Levites, and people took up their residence in their cities.¹

Two months were allowed the immigrants to settle themselves in their homes² and then a popular assembly was called. There was to be no further delay in introducing the Law; its introduction being the great object of the journey. The Book was brought. Ezra stood upon a platform which had been raised for this occasion, opened the Book and pronounced a benediction, to which the people responded with an Amen. The reading began, the Levites giving their assistance. Exactly how the part of the Levites is to be conceived is not clear. The account tells how the people were affected with grief at the reading, how they were encouraged and directed to observe the day as a joyous festival. The next day the reading was resumed and they reached the passage which gives directions concerning the observance of the Feast of Booths, and proceeded at once to the observance of this festival. We are told that it had not been observed from the days of Joshua.³

The auspicious beginning was followed by a revulsion; where all had seemed so fair there was a secret blot. The first immigrants, for these we must understand to be the guilty persons, had not kept their Israelite blood pure, but had intermarried with the people of the land. This discovery was a grief to Ezra, now the temporal and spiritual ruler of the community. When he heard of it he rent his clothes, tore his hair and beard, and sat on the ground deprived of speech. As evening approached he made confession of sin in a long prayer, the burden of which is the acknowledgment that intermarriage with the people of the land has been Israel's crying sin in the past, and that this sin still weighs upon them in the present.

A great assembly gathered about the praying scribe (we still follow the narrative) and joined in lamentation as he made his con-

¹ Professor Torrey makes Neh. 7⁷⁰ the continuation of Ezra, 8³⁶. I think more likely 7⁵ is the place to make the connexion. In this case Ezra inspects the genealogy of those already in the land and enrolls them in the community of which he is lawgiver, before reading the Law to them.

² They had reached Jerusalem the first day of the fifth month (Ezra, 7⁹); the assembly was called in the seventh month (Neh. 7⁷³).

³ Specific directions for the construction of booths are found only in Lev. 23⁴⁰—a part of the Holiness Code.

fession. One of the leaders encouraged him boldly to take hold of the evil and to undertake a reform, promising that the people would make a solemn agreement to divorce the obnoxious wives and send them away with their children. Ezra therefore imposed an oath on all the leaders that they would carry out this programme. Another solemn assembly was called and the greater excommunication was threatened against any who should not come. When the assembly met, Ezra made the demand that they put away all foreign wives. Some voices were raised in opposition, but the majority consented. In order that the matter might be certainly carried through, it was agreed to appoint a commission before which the offenders should come individually. The nobles and judges of the towns were to report to this commission. Every precaution was taken to make the action effective. The commission was appointed and completed their work in three months. A list is given of those who were found guilty and who put away wives and children.¹

Three weeks later another solemn assembly is held.² The true Israel has now separated itself from strangers and is ready to renew the covenant. After a public reading of the Law, a solemn confession of sin is made, with a rehearsal of Yahweh's goodness in the past. This is followed by a solemn league and covenant signed by the leaders of the people and by the heads of the priesthood. They are supported by the whole assembly, who take upon themselves a solemn oath to obey the Law of God, specifying the particulars which they need especially to guard from negligence. First of all comes the vow not to intermarry with the Gentiles.³ Then is emphasised the observance of the Sabbaths and festivals by the refusal to trade with any on those days. With this goes the observance of the Sabbatical year. The support of the sanctuary by a poll-tax follows.⁴ An apportionment

¹ Ezra, 9 and 10. The consistency of the act from the legalistic view is praised by Whiston in his note to Josephus, *Ant.* XI., 5, 4. More modern readers are likely to condemn it as cruel, and as contrary to the true spirit of Israel's religion.

² Following Torrey, I find Ezra, 10⁴⁴, continued in Neh. 9.

³ The *people of the land* here spoken of are identified by the writer with the ancient Canaanites. In fact, they were only such as could not prove their pure Judaite blood.

⁴ A third of a shekel is the amount fixed—afterward raised to a half-shekel. This may have in mind the tax which Ezekiel allows the prince to levy for the sacrifices.

for the supply of wood for the altar is next made by lot. Further specifications concern the first-fruits, firstlings, and tithes. The conclusion of the account sets forth the measures taken to repopulate Jerusalem, and gives more of those lists of which the Chronicler is so fond.¹

We have already commented upon this author's idea of the exile. He supposed the whole of Israel to have been carried away from their land. There were left in the country only the Samaritans and some remains of the old Canaanitish population. He supposed that at the close of the exile the people returned in two sections. The first detachment came with Zerubbabel and after some delay succeeded in building the Temple. The second and more important caravan came with Ezra; more important in the eyes of the narrator because they brought the ancient Law with them. Only with the adoption of the Law was the nation fully reconstituted. Both returns were accomplished by the wholly miraculous intervention of Yahweh, who moved upon the heart, first of Cyrus, then of Artaxerxes.

That the picture is almost wholly drawn from the imagination of the author must be evident. The decree of Artaxerxes is a historic impossibility. It was much for a king to give Nehemiah the power which he actually exerted. But the explanation is ready at our hand—Nehemiah was a trusted personal servant of the king. But Ezra had no such claims to consideration. Nehemiah, moreover, received the governorship of a petty district, with power to accomplish a certain limited work. Ezra has regal authority and the disposition of the imperial treasury. It was much for Nehemiah to receive such a position from a Gentile king. For Ezra to receive so much more would have been a miracle indeed. Doubtless the favour of Artaxerxes toward Nehemiah suggested the idea of his decree for Ezra. The question remains: if Ezra had received his powers and prerogatives in the seventh year of Artaxerxes, why should Nehemiah need to make his journey thirteen years later?²

This brings us to the most surprising fact of all. Neither Nehemiah nor Ezra knows anything of the other. Ezra makes

¹ The final chapter of Nehemiah, in which Nehemiah's memoirs seem to be resumed, is also apparently an invention of the Chronicler.

² I assume (as seems clear from the narrative) that the same Artaxerxes is intended in the two cases.

his journey first and accomplishes wonders ; but Nehemiah has no word for him and his work. Ezra describes the dedication of the wall, but is entirely silent as to its builder. One would think that the two men would work together and each give due honour to the other. If we had only the story of Ezra we should know nothing of Nehemiah¹—and the converse is also true. And as we look closer we see that Ezra cannot have done what he is said to have done before the coming of Nehemiah. Where in Ezra's time were all those turbulent nobles who were grieved that a man had come to seek the welfare of Israel? Were they the men to cower before a scribe, when they plotted so persistently against the governor of Jerusalem? They were certainly not the men tamely to accept the Law at Ezra's hands and to put away wives and children at his bidding. But they nowhere appear in the narrative, and this is only one of the inexplicable things in this inexplicable story. Yet, incomprehensible as it is if taken as history, so comprehensible is it if taken as an imaginative tradition.

As has been pointed out by others, Ezra is unknown, not only to Nehemiah, but to Jesus ben Sira, who wrote in the early part of the second century B.C. In his catalogue of heroes of Israel he has a place for Nehemiah, but none for Ezra. In 2 Maccabees also it is Nehemiah, rather than Ezra, who collects the sacred books in a library. It is impossible to suppose that either of these writers would have passed over Ezra had he been known to them.

What then is the historical fact which the story of Ezra represents? It is this: During the century after Nehemiah the community in Judah was becoming more rigid in its exclusiveness and in its devotion to the ritual. Ezra is the impersonation of both tendencies. Whether there was a scribe named Ezra is not a matter of great importance. Very likely there was such a scribe to whose name tradition attached itself. First it transferred the favour of Artaxerxes to him from Nehemiah. Then it made him the hero of the introduction of the Law. And finally it attributed to him the abrogation of the mixed marriages. It is not unlikely that Nehemiah, after building the wall, induced the people to take upon themselves obligations such as are re-

¹The bare occurrence of the name at the head of those who signed the covenant (Neh. 10²) is only the exception that proves the rule.

counted in the history.¹ The things emphasised there are such as the Babylonian Jews had most at heart—purity of blood, observance of the Sabbath, and care for the Temple service. The signing of such a covenant would put the scribes in a position of advantage. To do them justice, these men were fully possessed by an idea—the idea that if the Law of God could be perfectly obeyed, Israel's future would be glorious. The Law which was to be obeyed was in their hands and they were its authoritative expounders. If only the Great King would give them power to enforce it, what might they not do for Israel's benefit! The wish was father to the thought, and the thought gave rise to the story of Ezra. Ezra was the ideal scribe, as Solomon was the ideal king, projected upon the background of an earlier age.

As soon as the observance of a complicated code becomes the most important thing in life the expounders of that code become the most important men in the community. The rise of the class of scribes is certainly one of the most important events of postexilic history. It was, in fact, a process rather than an event. It was complete by the time of the Chronicler. Several generations of earnest and self-denying men must have wrought to secure the triumph of their order. That triumph is the logical result of Ezekiel's theory. The new Israel is no longer a nation; it is a church whose whole reason for being is the sustentation of divine service, and the conservation of that holiness which is required for such service. The emphasis laid upon the interests of the priests and Levites is not because the scribes usually belonged to this class. These interests are defended because priests and Levites are necessary to the carrying on of the Temple service.

The ideal of holiness—that is, of complete separation from all that is not consecrated to Yahweh—is most plainly, we might say brutally, set before us in the account of the divorce of foreign wives. The seed of Israel must be kept pure from intermixture; this wholly physical precaution is the Chronicler's interpretation of the injunction to be holy. In his zeal for purity of blood he puts the people of the land (most of them Israelite in blood) in the place of the Canaanites and Amorites of which history told him. This is no doubt the idea of Babylonian Judaism carried

¹ In fact, Neh. 10 may have been expanded from something in Nehemiah's memoirs. It has often been remarked that the obligations of this covenant are not specifically those of the Priest-code.

over into Palestine. It was natural for those who, in the time of Nehemiah and after, returned to the old home, to affiliate themselves with the stricter party there. This party would readily count their opponents to be heathen. The separation became wider with time and culminated in the Samaritan schism. It was pictured in the Chronicler's mind as a divorce between faithful Jews and their Gentile wives. The cruelty of turning wife and child out of doors would be no reason why the Law should not be observed. But the logic of the scribe would certainly have failed to carry through a measure of the kind had the test been actually made. What the narrative means to do is to emphasise the prohibition of intermarriage; and since to refuse to take a Gentile wife is a very different thing from divorcing one who has acquired rights in the home, the prohibition prevailed, at least, among the stricter Jews.

That it did not prevail without protest is made evident by one of the most delightful pieces of Hebrew literature that have come down to us—the book of Ruth. This is a powerful pamphlet on the side of the foreign wives. Ruth, the heroine, is a Moabitess, a member of the tribe which is specifically denied the rights of citizenship in Israel even after ten generations.¹ This foreigner is taken to wife by a good Israelite—a native of Bethlehem. After her husband's death she does not regard herself as freed from the obligation to his people, but returns with her mother-in-law to the country of Judah. There she is married to the next of kin,² who is set before us as a model of piety, generosity, and chastity. The marriage is a source of blessing, not only to the parties concerned, but also to all Israel, for from this marriage came David, the great and pious king. The story is told with charming simplicity and freshness and its force as an argument is unmistakable. If in the old days Israel had acted on the principles of the exclusive party, Ruth and her son would have been excommunicated. Where then would have been the Judean monarchy? Where the organization of the priesthood? Where the Temple itself?

¹ The regulation found in the Law (Deut. 23³) means that if a Moabite becomes a settler (client) in Israel, his descendants shall never acquire full rights of citizenship.

² Or rather to the nearest kinsman of her husband who is willing to exercise his right.

But the protest was of no avail. The stricter party had a final answer in their steady reaffirmation of the principle: the holy seed must be kept pure. The Chronicler affirms that the rigid law, directed primarily against the Moabite and Ammonite, was extended so as to cover every case where mixed blood was suspected. One Eliashib, a prominent member of the priestly order, having authority in the Temple, gave storage to the effects of Tobiah—apparently the Ammonite who opposed Nehemiah.¹ In connexion with the excommunication of the mixed multitude, these goods were summarily thrown out and the room was restored to its original use. It is evident that such measures must have involved also the banishment of Eliashib.

It is possible that we have here a confused account of the Samaritan schism. Concerning this we have Josephus's narrative as follows: One Sanballat was appointed satrap of Samaria by Darius, the last king of Persia. He gave his daughter in marriage to Manasseh, brother of the Jewish high-priest. The elders of the Jews, however, were indignant at the marriage of one of priestly blood with a foreigner, and demanded that Manasseh should divorce her. He, supposing himself to be next in succession to the high-priesthood (the highest dignity in Judea), told his father-in-law that though he loved his wife he was not willing on her account to be shut out from the high-priesthood. On this representation Sanballat promised Manasseh that he would make him high-priest and governor in Samaria and would build him a temple on Mount Gerizim. Manasseh agreed to this, and on migrating to Samaria was joined by many priests and Levites who left Jerusalem because of the proscription of mixed marriages. So far Josephus.²

The Sanballat of this account is doubtless the Horonite who gave Nehemiah so much trouble.³ It is not improbable that the quarrels between Nehemiah and the country party led to a definite separation. In that case Josephus's date is not accurate. But what is quite certain is that the stringency of the Jews in Jerusalem in the matter of foreign alliances led to the formation

¹ The story (Neh. 13) is told as if by Nehemiah. But it is difficult to place it in his memoirs and the style is that of the Chronicler.

² Josephus, *Antiquities*, XI, 8, 1.

³ Neh. 13²⁸ gives Sanballat's connexion with Eliashib; a daughter of Sanballat was married to one of Eliashib's grandsons.

of the Samaritan community. Each party was sure that it was the true Israel and the people of Yahweh. When the Temple at Jerusalem was closed to all who could not prove their genealogy or who would not subscribe to the new regulations, those who were shut out were obliged to organise about another centre. Mount Gerizim naturally suggested itself. It was an ancient sanctuary, as is evident from the way it is treated in the book of Deuteronomy. As a sanctuary of Yahweh it could claim greater antiquity than the one at Jerusalem. There was no reason why this might not be a second Jerusalem with a Temple rivalling the other. So the schism became fixed and incurable, and the hatred of one sect for the other was as bitter as the hatred of brothers estranged usually is. But it must be remembered that the Samaritans were Jews to all intents and purposes.¹ They even adopted the Law in the form in which it is recorded in the Pentateuch and observed its precepts, though rejecting the later Rabbinical refinements.

What has been said about Ezra shows that the account given of the introduction of the Law by him belongs in the category of legend rather than fact. But the great historical fact remains that in this period the codification of ancient customs and regulations reached its conclusion.² The result was the highly composite and perplexing work which we call the Pentateuch. Certain elements of this book have already been considered. In its final form it included as part of itself the ancient Covenant Code, the patriarchal history which we have called J E, the enlarged book of Deuteronomy, and the Holiness Code, which shows the influence of Ezekiel. What is left after separating these earlier documents represents several stages of development. We have no difficulty in recognising one hand in the historical work which is usually assigned to a priestly writer,³ and which furnished the framework into which the earlier documents were fitted. Its peculiarities have already been considered in the early chapters

¹ Rabbinical recognition of the difference between Samaritans and heathen is pointed out by Schürer, *Gesch. d. Jüd. Volkes*,³ II. p. 17f.

² Or at least reached a provisional conclusion. There can be no doubt that the process of legal development went on, and in principle there is no dividing line between the Tora and the Mishna.

³ And is therefore usually designated as P. It is not so certain as has been supposed, that the historical sketch was composed as an introduction to a code.

of the present history.¹ We need only recall that P rewrote the narrative of the creation, the deluge, the patriarchs, the exodus, and the wandering, with the idea of displacing the earlier stories which were in many respects distasteful to him. In doing this his purpose is to give the correct view of God, who is to him spiritual and transcendental. He therefore avoids the anthropomorphisms of his predecessors. He also desires to mark the stages of exclusion by which Israel came to be the true people of Yahweh. Beginning with the creation and passing rapidly to the Deluge he narrows his view to Abraham, and in the family of Abraham dismisses first Ishmael and then Esau, so as to confine his view to Jacob. That his picture of the patriarchs reveals no sins on their part has already been remarked, as also that the result is to give us figures without life and scenes without colour. That he emphasises genealogies and chronologies shows a tendency prominent in later Judaism, as is illustrated by the book of Chronicles.

One thing interested the priestly writer, however, and that was the origin of Israel's institutions. The account of the creation, as he gives it, culminates in the Sabbath. It is not so much that he thinks the Sabbath obligatory on all mankind (for he gives no command for its observance), as that he conceives of God Himself as obedient to the Law.² The Deluge culminates in a covenant with Noah, sealed by the rainbow, and embracing the prohibition of blood as food. Here we can have no doubt that the author enacts a law for all mankind. It is interesting to note that he does not command sacrifice. Sacrifice was introduced (according to his theory) by the commands given at Sinai and was lawful only at the single sanctuary of Israel. Therefore he gives mankind permission to slay and eat, only forbidding the use of the blood. With the prohibition of blood, he also supposes the death penalty for murder to have been introduced. In fact the institution of blood-revenge is one of the earliest of social customs.

In the patriarchal period, the author thinks it worth while to dwell upon two incidents only. The first is the custom of circumcision. This is solemnly enjoined as a seal of the covenant with Abraham. The author probably knew of the observance of this

¹ Above, pp. 11, 12, 31, 35.

² Parallels in the literature of later Judaism are well known.

rite among what we may call the Abrahamic peoples. The second is the purchase of the cave of Machpelah by Abraham from the people of the land. It seems almost as if he were asserting Israel's right to the ancient burial-place of the patriarchs as against the Edomites, or at least as if he were asserting Israel's equal right with the Edomites. Among all the sacred places of the land outside Jerusalem, this is the only one in which the author has an interest. From his predecessors he takes the account of Yahweh's revelation of His name to Moses, and the institution of the Passover at the exodus. In connexion with the latter he ordains the reform of the calendar.¹ His use of the miracles in Egypt has been already commented upon. The gift of manna, which is placed at the very beginning of the wandering, is made the occasion for emphasising anew the observance of the Sabbath.

Most characteristic of this author is the elaborate provision made for the sanctuary. The idea that Yahweh dwelt among His people even in the wilderness is old. The earlier history speaks of the Tent of Meeting which Moses pitched outside the camp.² Possibly the Ark was a still earlier provision for Yahweh's journey. But the priestly writer was not content without making the Dwelling a worthy one, according to later ideas. It was not difficult to argue that the holiness of Yahweh should be guarded in the wilderness as strictly as it was afterward guarded in Jerusalem. Hence he makes Moses on the mount, first receive the command to make the Tabernacle, with elaborate specifications—just as Ezekiel began his reconstructed commonwealth with a plan of the new Temple.

It would be sacrilegious to suppose that a more perfect plan could be devised for the Dwelling than the one revealed to Solomon and afterward substantially duplicated in the vision vouchsafed to Ezekiel. This plan therefore our author took and showed considerable ingenuity in making on its lines a movable instead of a stationary structure. The Tabernacle of his devising is, in fact, the shadow of the Temple thrown upon the background of the desert life. It has its inner chamber, the private apartment of the divinity. This is made of beams ingeniously fitted together to make a cubical room—the shape was that of

¹ This is really dating postexilic usage back to the time of Moses.

² Ex. 33⁷⁻¹¹ (E), Num. 11¹⁶, 12⁴.

the Most Holy in the Temple, only here the dimensions are half those of Solomon's building. Within this room the Ark is placed. In the description of this long-lost palladium it was easy to overlay it with gold, and for the two gigantic cherubim of Solomon to give it two small ones of gold overshadowing the cover. This central room being provided, it was only logical to make the anteroom with its table of bread and its candelabrum. Heavy curtains, the inner of fine texture, the outer of leather, cover the whole structure. Around all is a court fenced off by curtains stretched upon posts, to keep the area sacred from intrusion. For the sacrificial worship a copper altar is provided, or rather, one of wood overlaid with metal.¹

Such a sanctuary must be provided with a corps of attendants. For the priesthood (in the narrower sense) Aaron and his sons are chosen. Elaborate vestments are wrought for them. The first act of sacrificial service in the history of Israel—and so the first legitimate sacrifice in the history of the world—is the offering by which Moses consecrates them to the priesthood. Only after the provision of this elaborate sanctuary does Moses receive the two tables which are the sign of the covenant and which are to repose in the Ark. And only after the consecration of the priests is the ritual law given to the people.² The first act of the newly consecrated priests is to offer the sacrifice which makes the people ritually fit to approach God. But the danger of an unacceptable service is set before us by the fate of Nadab and Abihu, two of Aaron's sons. By an act of criminal carelessness they "offered strange fire" in their censers and were smitten by a fire from Yahweh so that they died.³ The incident is made the occasion for regulating the manner of Aaron's entrance into the sanctuary.⁴

Aaron and his sons having been consecrated, it is time to introduce the Levites, their subordinates and helpers. Our narrative

¹ How far these devices would be practicable if the endeavour were made to use them as working directions is a question that did not much trouble the author and need not detain us.

² Recent commentators have shown that the account of the actual building of the Sanctuary (Ex. 35-40) is a very late insertion of the narrative. That we have several strata of P to deal with, is clear from the duplication of the command for Aaron's consecration (Ex. 29, and Lev. 8).

³ Lev. 10¹⁻⁵. The only sin of the two men seems to have been that they took fire from somewhere else than the altar.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 16. The chapter has been worked over more than once.

therefore tells of the choice of the tribe of Levi for this purpose. They were substituted for the first-born males of Israel, to which Yahweh had a claim since the exodus.¹ The congregation is now prepared to take up its march and soon comes to the border of the promised land. Here the obstinacy of the people comes out in their refusal to invade the country. No sooner is this matter settled than a band of Levites headed by Korah claims priestly prerogatives and presumes to offer incense. In this act they are smitten by the avenging fire of Yahweh.² Not long after this the congregation murmur again at Moses and Aaron, and these two leaders are betrayed into sinful impatience. This shows that they have reached the end of their usefulness. Aaron dies at Mount Hor after Eleazar has been inducted into his office.³ A few days later, when the border of Canaan is reached, Moses is directed to take a look at the Promised Land. At his request Joshua is appointed as his successor, being confirmed by Eleazar. Moses ascends Mount Nebo and there ends his career.⁴

As we are here concerned with the formation of the Jewish book of the Law we may leave to one side questions concerning the conclusion of P's narrative. Undoubtedly the author went on to describe the conquest and division of the land. But the compiler of the book of Joshua did not make this narrative the basis of his work in the same way as did the compiler of the first five books. This editor took the history of P and made it the framework into which with commendable piety he fitted the other documents of which we have spoken. He, or his school, also supplemented the legislation already in their hands with such fragments of tradition as they could discover not yet published. These fragments preserve for us some ancient customs, so that we find united in this code institutions and observances representing all stages of Israel's religious development except the polytheistic. The interest of the final redactor, or school of

¹ Num. 3⁵⁻¹³. The analysis in these early chapters of Numbers presents peculiar difficulties. I have followed, in the main, Carpenter and Battersby, *The Hexateuch*.

² Num. 19. The account of Korah is now fused with that of Dathan and Abiram.

³ *Ibid.*, 20¹⁻¹³, 32-29.

⁴ The original order was Deut. 32⁴⁸⁻⁵², Num. 27¹⁵⁻²³, Deut. 34. This order was necessarily disarranged when Deuteronomy was inserted as the testament of Moses.

redactors, was to make of Israel the church-nation, separate as far as possible from secular affairs and wholly consecrated to Yahweh. The sanctity of the people is guarded not alone by the provisions of the Holiness Code. These are extended and made more rigid. The defilement which may be contracted from unclean animals, from childbirth, from leprosy and other diseases is defined, and directions are given for its treatment. The interest of the author is not sanitary but religious. He gives no directions for the medical treatment of leprosy (for example), but he is very stern in shutting the leper out of the congregation, because his presence there is an offence to Yahweh's holiness.

A curious example of the way in which ancient religious ideas have been carried over into these new and strenuous regulations is seen in the law for the great Day of Atonement. In order that the sacredness of the people may be kept intact it is enjoined that once a year there shall be an expiation made to cover whatever defilement may not have been purged by the ordinary services. Besides the sacrifices appropriate to such a day we have the command for the scapegoat.¹ This is a goat laden (symbolically) with the sins of the people and then sent off into the wilderness *for Azazel*, that is, for one of the wilderness demons which the people formerly worshipped.²

Some other archaic features of this code are of interest here. Among them we are tempted to count the specific permission to offer doves at the altar. The dove was anciently sacred to Astarte, and we should expect it to be taboo to the worshippers of Yahweh. Not to lay stress upon this, we may justifiably pause at the bells and pomegranates of the high-priest's robe. The pomegranates are certainly a relic of early heathenism, and the bells which notify Yahweh of the minister's approach (for so we must account for their use) do not accord with the postexilic theory of God's spirituality and omniscience. More striking is the jealousy ordeal which is conserved for us in the ritual. It is plain that the curses which are written out and then washed into the water which the woman drinks are regarded as materi-

¹ I retain the ordinary term because I do not know any better one to substitute. The law for the Day is found in Lev. 16, imbedded in the general directions for Aaron's entrance into the Sanctuary.

² The sections which mention Azazel are a later insertion in the text of P. But it is evident that they represent very ancient usage.

ally conveyed into the woman's body where they work magically upon her.¹ The Nazirites who are mentioned in the immediate sequel also represent an early stage of Israel's religion.

We should misunderstand the priestly writers were we to suppose them compiling a manual for the priestly caste. They are fully imbued with the notion that correct performance of the sacred rites is necessary to the well-being of Israel—not alone for the Jews in Palestine, but for those in Babylonia as well. So long as the cultus was carried on, they could be sure of the favour of Yahweh; should it be interrupted or be desecrated no Jew could rest in security. The book of the Law was intended to inform the people not only how they must live themselves but how the priests must carry on the service. The result was to make the laymen the sharpest critics of the priests. The resulting bitterness of the Pharisees against careless priests is a well-known feature of the later history. In this view of the cultus we miss the spontaneity of the earlier documents. The sacrificial system was originally man's natural expression of his feeling toward God. To eat and drink and rejoice before Yahweh was a ritual that needed no exhortation and which received little regulation. The postexilic time had really outgrown such expressions of piety. God was greater, more spiritual, and farther away than He had seemed to be in the earlier time. The cultus had become a thing ordained by Him as the expression of His will; therefore it must be punctiliously performed. We may almost imagine its most devoted supporters sometimes wishing that God had been pleased to enjoin some other method of serving Him.

If the elaborate service of the sanctuary is to be regularly performed the order of ministers must be worthily supported. It was not because the men whom we have called the priestly writers were themselves priests that they so carefully regulated the tithes and other sources of Levitical income. Probably the writers were not themselves members of the guild whose interests they had so much at heart. They were laymen who felt that the service of the sanctuary was the most important thing in the world. All the weight of tradition in favour of giving tithes

¹ Num. 5¹¹⁻³¹. I do not mean that this regulation is of heathen origin, but that it represents the early religion of Israel. A parallel is found in Egyptian religion, cf. Wiedemann, *Religion of the Ancient Egyptians*, p. 58.

and first-fruits and a share of the offerings to the priests was therefore emphasised by them. The result was to lay upon Israel a yoke which no people could long bear. But no considerations of mere expediency influenced the consistent theorists with which we now have to do.

In one respect, however, we must modify what has been said about the cultus. There was, no doubt, a real religious feeling expressed in the sin-offerings which had now become so prominent. The theory that the whole Law must be thoroughly and scrupulously obeyed had as its result the depressing conviction that this was an almost impossible task. Every hour of the day a man was subject to contagion. Any moment of carelessness might cause him to forget some one of the regulations of his code. For intentional violation of the Law there was nothing but punishment, either excommunication from the chosen people or visitation by an act of God. But what should be done in case of unintentional sin? This sin was truly sin, it was an offence against the sanctity of God; it might work ruin, not only upon the guilty party, but also upon all his race. Fortunately a class of offerings had existed from of old (though not emphasised in the pre-exilic time) whose effect was to appease the anger of God. These now become prominent in the service and it is provided that they may be offered by individuals who discover or who suspect their own neglect. It is provided also that they shall be offered on stated occasions, to make amends for the possible carelessness of priests and people. It follows that the system of the completed Law is on the whole sombre in its tone. In this it no doubt reflects the prevailing mood of post-exilic Israel. For, as we have seen, the experiences of exile and of oppression had fostered just this frame of mind.¹

It is partly because of the sorrowful experiences of the present that the priestly school finds its ideal in the past. In their view Israel in the wilderness possessed the strength and majesty which should belong to the people of God. The organization of the twelve tribes, each with fifty thousand warriors, more or less, is

¹ How far Babylonian influence can be traced in the Priest-code is not yet satisfactorily made out. It would be strange not to find some such influence; cf. Haupt in the *Johns Hopkins University Circulars*, May, 1900, and in the *Journal of Bib. Lit.* XIX, pp. 55-81; also *Keilinschriften und Altes Testament*,³ p. 589 f.

complete. When they march they move like an army with banners, and when they camp, they camp in perfect order in a square whose centre is the Tabernacle. Next to the sanctuary is the tribe of Levi to guard it from profanation, and this tribe has its standing orders concerning the removal and carriage of the sacred tent.¹ All this embellishment of the history has no direct practical value. It only expresses the conviction that in some sense the wilderness sojourn was the golden age of Israel's life. There at any rate the theocracy was in full sway. When that should again be the case there would be room for another forward move in history. For the authors had a dim idea of progress. Their world periods are marked by the Deluge and the exodus. But within the periods there is no movement. Evidently all that can be done in the present time is to conserve the system introduced by Moses at its beginning. During the period now under review the stricter party in Jerusalem were holding on to the observance of the Law with the idea that they were thus living up to the perfect standard set by Yahweh Himself. In this observance they found comfort and satisfaction under manifold afflictions. Doubtless the more ritually inclined found in the Law the complete response to their soul's need. But others were meanwhile cherishing the Messianic hope and searching the prophetic writings which had come down from earlier times. We shall not go astray, in fact, if we locate in this period the collection into one corpus of the books, Joshua to Malachi, which form the second part of the Jewish canon.²

In this collection is a little book which probably originated in this time and which throws light upon the mind of the people. This is the book which bears the name of Joel. Its immediate occasion is a plague of locusts such as often devastates the lands bordering on the desert. In animated language the author describes the invading host and calls the people to lament over its desolating career. In sharp contrast to the theory of the earlier prophets he lays emphasis upon fasting and sackcloth as means of influencing Yahweh. The priests are urged to lead in the supplication—evidence of their present importance in the community.

¹ Num. 7 and 10. The regulations belong to the latest stratum of priestly legislation.

² One or two sections which bear marks of a later date will be considered soon.

The description of the plague shows that the author identifies it with the invasion of Gog predicted by Ezekiel. The prayers of the people (united at the Temple) are effective with Yahweh. He inclines to His people and removes the plague from them. Renewed and increased fruitfulness will recompense them for the years which the locust has eaten.

The great invasion is looked upon as the forerunner of the Day of Yahweh. After the plague has been removed the Messianic time will come. The Spirit—the incentive to prophecy—will be poured out upon all flesh. Men-servants and maid-servants shall partake of the wonderful endowment. The extraordinary manifestations of the Spirit will moreover be ushered in by convulsions of nature—blood and fire and columns of smoke. Yahweh will muster all nations in the Valley of Judgment,¹ and call them to strict account for their oppression of Israel. With what measure they have meted it shall be measured to them. Judah will now take possession of the Gentiles and sell them as slaves to the far countries. Or in another figure borrowed from an earlier prophet, Yahweh is presented as the treader of grapes; the nations are the vintage and He will crush them as the grapes are crushed in the wine-press. After the judgment, Judah will dwell safely, and Jerusalem shall be uncontaminated by the Gentiles. Palestine will abound in wine and milk, but Egypt shall be a desolation and Edom shall lie waste.

The Messianic expectation has here become almost stereotyped. Vengeance is to be taken on the heathen; Judah is to have a golden age of agriculture; prophecy is not to be monopolised by the select few—these features are all that stand out distinctly. The personal Messiah does not appear at all. Moreover, there is no thought of a great moral reformation. There is, to be sure, a call to repentance, fasting, and mourning. But we feel that this is only because these spiritual exercises are the traditional way of approaching Yahweh. The people are conscious that they are living in accordance with the Law and are the people of Yahweh. Of the conversion of the heathen there seems to be no thought. The Gentile nations are brought into judgment simply that they

¹ The valley of Jehoshaphat appears here for the first time. Doubtless the name (*Yahweh judges*) was coined by Joel. That he locates the great judgment at Jerusalem is probable, and to this extent the application of the name to the Kedron is justified.

may be destroyed and that Judah may be no more molested. The author seems to look for the Day of Yahweh in the immediate future. Yet there is a certain pallor about the expectation. We feel that there will be no acute disappointment should there be delay. The people are not ambitious for great things. If only the locust and the drought can be removed they will be fairly content to go on as they are. They have no desire to become a world-power. The mood is that of a small and exclusive sect—enjoying their snug exclusiveness and willing to let the world ignore them if only they can be undisturbed.

The idea of the judgment of the nations here adopted, or expanded, from Ezekiel, is a common theme of later apocalyptic writers. Not long after the writer we have just considered, it was borne in afresh upon men's minds. The Persian monarchy was showing signs of decay. The invasion of the heart of the empire by Cyrus the Younger and the retreat of the ten thousand Greeks revealed an unsuspected weakness. Egypt soon stirred Syria to revolt and the flames of war again passed over Palestine. Under Artaxerxes Ochus (B.C. 361-336) an immense army flooded Phœnicia and Egypt, working havoc wherever it went. Whether Jerusalem had taken part in the revolt is not clear. Josephus, who tells us that Bagoses, the Persian general, desecrated the Temple, does not speak of any injury done to the Temple or the city walls. He says only that Bagoses punished the Jews by imposing a tax on the daily sacrifices.¹

These events stimulated the apocalyptic imagination of the Jews, and they saw again in the swift invader the advance guard of the great Day. Recent scholars² find a monument of these disturbances in the latest section of the book of Isaiah—chapters 24-27. The chapters take up and expand Joel's picture of the judgment of the nations. Yahweh is represented desolating the earth; people and priest, servant and master, buyer and seller are involved in a common fate. Wrath shall be poured out, not only on the kings of the earth, but also upon the heavenly host—the angels who were appointed to administer the affairs of the

¹ Josephus (*Ant.* XI, 7, 1) makes the occasion of Bagoses' invasion to be a quarrel about the high-priesthood.

² Preceded by Vatke; cf. Cheyne, *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah*, p. 160.

world and who have been unfaithful.¹ But the dispersed of Judah are to be spared—a remnant like the olives left on the tree after the crop has been gathered. These shall see the new day, the rule of Yahweh on Mount Zion:

“On this mountain will Yahweh Sabaoth make to all peoples
A feast of fat things, a feast of wine on the lees.
Of fat things full of marrow, of wine on the lees well strained.
On this mountain will He annihilate
The veil which veils all peoples,
The covering which covers all nations:
Yea, the Lord Yahweh will wipe away tears from all faces,
And the reproach of His people will He take away throughout all
the earth.”²

This expectation differs from any we have yet met in the pathetic expression: “Yahweh will wipe away tears from all faces”—a hope that has passed over into Christian literature. As we read it we ask ourselves: Can it be any earthly clime in which this hope is to be realised? Is not the Messianic kingdom cutting loose from earth and seeking its habitation in another world? Certainly the way is preparing for the celestial city.

Reviewing the period whose history we have now tried to trace, we are impressed again with the importance of Nehemiah and his work. Without him the separation of the stricter party would not have been accomplished, or else the party would have lacked staying power and have been ground to pieces by the adverse tendencies of the times. The separation once accomplished, the prominence of the Law and its expansion followed as a matter of course. The Law in turn strengthened the party which cherished it, and made their exclusiveness more marked. The religious emotions easily learn to express themselves in the forms hallowed by tradition and sanctioned by a divine command. While the legalism which we find fully fledged at the end of the period may sometimes have fostered formalism and hypocrisy, this was by no means universally true. The Psalms show how many a pious soul learned to delight in the Law of Yahweh after the inward man. To such

¹ The conception that the angels have been appointed satraps of the provinces under Yahweh's rule, is found in some other late passages, and is more fully developed in the book of Daniel.

² Isaiah, 25⁶⁻⁸; Cheyne's translation.

souls it was a boon to have prescribed forms in which to express their devotion—this is illustrated in other religions besides Judaism. For a time of temporal ill-fortune it is a comfort to have one's thoughts turned to what may be done for God. And that this will of God was in a book was also a boon to the oppressed and heavy laden. Study is the solace of many an aching heart. By attending to the sacred Book the mind learns to detach itself from the cares of this life and fix itself upon what belongs to God. In the period under review the external fortune of the Jews was at a low ebb. Complaints of oppression, of persecution, of the scoffing of the proud, are almost a common-place of the Psalms, many of which date from this period. But along with these complaints we find testimonies that God is near the humble and that He sustains those who trust in Him. In this experience the pious found the reward of obedience, though this reward was not the one upon which they had fixed their hopes.

CHAPTER XVIII

THE GREEK PERIOD

ALEXANDER of Macedon defeated the Persian army at Issus in the year 333 B.C. To break the naval power of his adversary it was necessary for him to get full possession of the Syrian coast. He therefore marched at once toward Egypt, making everything secure as he went. At only two points was there opposition—at Tyre and at Gaza, both which cities had furnished contingents to the Persian fleet. Tyre fell after an obstinate resistance of seven months. The length of the siege of Gaza is given at two months. Thus the maritime plain was in Greek possession and, with this secure, the interior of Palestine must also yield. The cities of the highland can hardly have been of much importance. Jerusalem was no longer the capital of the country in any sense. Its wealth had long departed and the Arabian trade, once exploited by Solomon, now went to the Philistine towns.

A Jewish legend preserved by Josephus recounts that in his progress toward Egypt Alexander sent a message to the high-priest summoning him to acknowledge his new master. The high-priest (the story correctly represents him to be the political head of the community) replied that his allegiance was sworn to Darius and that to him he would be true. Alexander therefore marched from Gaza to punish the contumacious city. The high-priest's loyalty to his oath was of no very enduring quality. In the old days the citizens would have manned the walls and stood a siege. In the present emergency the ruler took refuge in spectacular devices. Warned by a dream he arranged a procession to meet the king. Without arms but in full pontificals, accompanied by a train of priests and citizens all clothed in white, he marched out of the city to the hill (Scopus) over which the conqueror was approaching. Alexander, to the surprise of his staff, without waiting for the obeisance of the approaching train, himself did obeisance to the high-priest and declared that this was the figure which he had seen in a dream

early in his career and which had promised him the dominion of Asia. In consequence of the interview he showed favour to the city, offered sacrifice in the Temple, and exempted the people from paying tribute every seventh—that is, the Sabbatical—year.

This story is indeed the stuff that dreams are made of. It is unnecessary to dwell upon its improbabilities.¹ Not to speak of Greek authors who know nothing of the incident, the tradition if reliable would have been known to the author of Daniel, for he shows himself familiar with the history of the Ptolemies and Seleucids, and so edifying a story would have impressed itself upon him. Legends about Alexander began to circulate soon after his death. Which one of these Josephus used to embellish his history we cannot make out. Whatever it was, we are unable to use it for the history of the Jews. Probably Jerusalem had no such importance in Alexander's eyes as to call for a personal visit. It was only one town out of many in the province of Syria. This province had been secured by the surrender of the Persian governor. The Greek sources say distinctly that the rest of Palestine had made its submission to Alexander before the siege of Gaza.²

The only early impression concerning Alexander recorded in a Jewish source, is that given in the book of Daniel. Here the Greek power is pictured to us as the most ferocious among the ferocious beasts which the sage sees in his vision: "The fourth beast, dreadful and terrible, and strong exceedingly; it had great iron teeth; it devoured and broke in pieces and stamped the residue with its feet."³ We can see that the rapidity and thoroughness of Alexander's conquests were enough to strike terror into the hearts of those who were conquered. More impressive even than his conquests was his method of unifying his empire by his numerous Greek colonies. The Greek was conscious of a world mission. The Babylonian and Persian had been content for the most part to leave the subject peoples with their own customs. The new power was a source of discomfort

¹ *Antiquities*, XI, 8. The improbabilities are most conclusively shown by Willrich, *Juden und Griechen vor der Makkabäischen Erhebung*, p. 6 ff. He refers to St. Croix, who took the same position in his *Examen Critique* in 1775. This book I have not seen.

² Arrian as cited by Willrich, *Juden und Griechen*, p. 15. I have not seen Donath's dissertation, *Die Alexandersage*, mentioned by Willrich.

³ Dan. 7⁷, cf. v.²³ and 8⁵⁻⁸.

to its subjects, not only because the mercenaries plundered and oppressed them, but also because it insisted on reconstructing their social and political fabric. The full import of this comes out a little after Alexander.

Alexander died before consolidating his empire. The period of bloodshed which followed his death has left no traces on the history of Judea,¹ or rather, the traces have disappeared from the records. The little district about Jerusalem often changed masters, as did the city itself, during those troublous times, and each change brought oppression and suffering. Palestine was the bone of contention between Ptolemy and Antigonos, later between the Ptolemies and the Seleucids. The first Ptolemy is said to have captured Jerusalem on a Sabbath, when the citizens would not fight, holding to the observance of the Law, even at the cost of slavery.²

At this time therefore a large number of Jews were carried as slaves into Egypt. The large Jewish population in Alexandria, of which we hear much at a later period, probably had its beginnings at this date. When once a nucleus was established by the manumission of some of these slaves the community would grow by attracting other Jews. The people had learned in Babylon how to live and yet preserve their separateness from the Gentiles. In Palestine the means of livelihood were scanty, and the miseries of war were chronic. Emigration would be the natural method of relief, and the fertile country of the Nile would attract those who sought a new home. It is not necessary to suppose that the Ptolemies colonised Alexandria with Jews or that a wholesale manumission of Jewish slaves took place, such as is attributed to Ptolemy Philadelphus.³ The age was an age of migration and the Jews felt the impulse. It was also an age in which the

¹ At about the period of Alexander's conquest some authors now place the discourses against the nations contained in the book of Jeremiah (chapters 25, 46-51). The arguments, however, seem precarious. Cf. Schwally in the *Zeitschr. f. d. Alttest. Wissensch.*, VIII, 177 ff., and Giesebrecht in his commentary.

² This question of the Sabbath again became a burning one in the time of the Maccabees. The incident under Ptolemy I. is taken by Josephus (*Ant.*, XII, 1, and *Against Apion*, I, 22) from a Greek author. The manner in which this author (Agatharchides of Cnidus) treats it, is a strong guarantee of its correctness, as is pointed out by Willrich, *Juden und Griechen*, p. 22.

³ In the letter of Aristeeas, 12-26.

cities assumed new importance under the influence of Greek ideas.¹

Ptolemy's possession of the country was contested by Antigonus, who in 315 B.C. took possession of Syria down to the Egyptian frontier. The Egyptians repulsed him (or his son Demetrius) in a hard-fought battle at Gaza three years later. The next year, however, Antigonus returned and again took possession of the country with the expectation of carrying the war into Africa. Although the invasion of Egypt was not successful, Syria remained six years in his power. But now Antigonus (perhaps the ablest of the aspirants to Alexander's empire) was opposed by a coalition and by them defeated and slain in the year 301 B.C.² By this battle Seleucus was secured in the possession of the eastern provinces of Alexander's empire. The two kingdoms with which the Jews had now to deal were Syria and Egypt. The former, under the rule of the house of Seleucus, extended from the bay of Issus to the frontiers of India. By express agreement, Egypt and the Ptolemies were to have Coëlesyria as it was called, that is, Palestine and the Lebanon. But now, as in the old days, the Mesopotamian power felt that its natural outlet toward the west was by the ports of the Mediterranean. Scarcely had Ptolemy taken possession of Palestine, therefore, when Seleucus with his victorious elephants advanced to contest his claim. The complicated struggle which ensued is difficult to follow intelligently, and its details do not specially concern an Old Testament historian. Seleucus seems to have been in control in Palestine in the year 295 B.C. Twenty years later Ptolemy Philadelphus came to the front and extended his sway as far as the Lebanon.³ Antiochus III., called the Great, vindicated the Seleucid claim in 219 B.C., but was obliged to retreat. A second attempt in 198 B.C. was more successful. From this time down to

¹ An inscription recently discovered shows that a synagogue was dedicated in one of the smaller towns of the Delta in the reign of Ptolemy Euergetes (247-222 B.C.); see Schürer in the *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 1903, col. 156.

² The battle of Ipsus in this year is one of the decisive battles of history. Cf. Stark, *Gaza und die Philistäische Küste* (1852), p. 359 ff.; Droysen, *Geschichte des Hellenismus*,³ II, 2, p. 216 ff.; Mahaffy, *Alexander's Empire*, p. 67.

³ Schürer, *Gesch. des Jüd. Volkes*³ II., p. 74. A chronological table covering the period from the death of Alexander to the Roman conquest of the East is given by Mahaffy, *Greek Life and Thought*, pp. xiv-xxxii.

the Roman supremacy the kingdom of Syria was supreme in Palestine.¹

Both Ptolemies and Seleucids were Greek by blood. Both families regarded themselves as legitimate successors of Alexander, and both desired to continue Alexander's policy of Hellenising the East. The most conspicuous feature of this new civilisation was the predominance of the city as a political entity. Semitic society is based on the tribe. This we see in the history of Israel. The cities—Hebron, Shechem, Samaria—nowhere take part in political movements; these movements spring from the tribes, Judah, Ephraim, or Benjamin. In the era now before us, the tribe disappears from view and the city takes its place. Nothing strikes the student more forcibly than the number of new cities that now come to the front. The old towns when conquered or surrendered are rebuilt and reorganised. By their side many new ones spring into existence. The kings are pre-eminently patrons of these cities, and whether the cities are rebuilt, enlarged, or newly founded, they receive Greek colonists. Alexander himself is said to have founded more than sixty of these cities in his brief career. The number founded by his successors rises into the hundreds. In Palestine, as elsewhere, old and new cities received the Greek organization. Besides the chief places in Philistia and across the Jordan, we read that Joppa, Dor, Accho, Bethshan (all Israelite by tradition) belong in this class. The state of things in Jerusalem is not revealed to us by any express declaration, and in the small district of which it was now the capital, we do not find any cities on the new model.

It was in accord with the Greek idea that the city should have its autonomy. This was carried out, so far as the supremacy of the king was not encroached upon. The seat of power was recognised to be the *demos*, the body of freemen. Along with them the city was inhabited by slaves and clients who had no voice in the Assembly. The administration was in the hands of a Council chosen from the freemen. So long as the taxes were paid, and so long as complaints of injustice were not heard, this body was allowed to carry on the government. The surrounding country and its villages naturally fell under its jurisdiction. The franchise was not confined to men of a single race. In

¹ As against any foreign claimant, that is; the actual condition under the Maccabean princes will be considered at length in the next chapter.

some instances it is clear that it was possessed by both Jews and Greeks in the same city.¹

Although we have no distinct assertion concerning Jerusalem in this period, we may readily suppose that the tendency toward new civic autonomy had a favourable effect on the depressed commonwealth of the Jews. Jerusalem under a Persian governor, though the centre of the district, had little opportunity to assert itself. Under the new system its predominance in the district would be emphasised. The headship of the community had been vested in the high-priest. The democratic organisation would readily associate with him a committee of influential citizens, and give him in some respects more real power than he had ever had. It does not seem forced, therefore, to suppose that the period before us saw the rise of the Sanhedrin—a senate whose importance for the later history of Judaism can scarcely be overestimated. At a later time we find that the smaller towns also had their Councils, but these do not emerge into view in the present period.

Greek colonies carried Greek culture, and Greek culture brought with it Greek religion. No city could be founded or repopulated by Alexander or his successors without receiving a patron deity from the Greek pantheon.² The gymnasium, the theatre, and the baths were consecrated each to its proper divinity. This would not be objectionable to most orientals. Syrians and Phoenicians discovered their own gods in those which came in with the new colonists. Melkart and Heracles were, in fact, identical in origin, and so were Aphrodite and Ishtar. Even where the identification could not be made, toleration was the rule. In polytheistic religions, a few gods more or less do not make much difference. The attractiveness of the Greek mythology in itself is evident from the spell which it still exercises on men of taste. The aggressive power of Greek art and literature (manifest throughout the new empire of Alexander) implied aggressive power also in Greek religion.

¹ Statements of Jewish writers on this subject are, however, to be received with caution. It was evidently to their interest to claim for their people everything that belonged to the most favoured nation.

² The importance of religion to the Greek city is well set forth by Fustel de Coulanges, *La Cité Antique* (I have the seventh edition, 1879; the English translation is dated 1877).

We cannot indeed suppose that the East was more than superficially Hellenised. Only the more educated or the more thoughtful minds could appreciate Greek literature, art, and philosophy. But the mass of men would be attracted by the brightness and gaiety of Greek life. Among the Jews we have found reason to suppose there were already two parties. The laxer one would not be slow to feel the new attraction. The stricter one had already adopted the maxim that Yahweh is a jealous God. His Law, which they were already translating into life, had protected His worshippers from contamination by Baal. It would prove sufficient to repel the seductions of Dionysus or Aphrodite. After some centuries, the thinking few discovered that it was possible to adopt Greek thought and (to a considerable extent) Greek culture without giving up Hebrew religion. But for the present the alternatives seemed to exclude each other.

The first effect of the new civilisation among the Jews was, as we might expect, a stout affirmation of the validity of the old system. On this supposition we can readily account for the book which we call Chronicles, one of the most important literary products of the period.¹ The author has in mind to write a complete history of his people in a form that will edify his contemporaries, and he does this with a thoroughness which in the view of his school must have left little to be desired. We have no difficulty in discovering what he thinks necessary to edify his contemporaries; it is to show the divine origin of the Hebrew commonwealth, its divine guidance, and its organisation from the beginning in the form it has taken in his own time.

Now, as we have seen, the postexilic community at Jerusalem was a church and not a state. Its centre was the Temple. The reason for its existence was the conservation of the Temple worship. In all honesty therefore the Chronicler held this thesis: The Temple is the central object of all human history. And his work is really a defence of this thesis. First we have an introductory section consisting of genealogies. These genealogies are made up from the older historical books and they are designed to

¹ Under Chronicles we include Ezra and Nehemiah. On the date and nature of the composition the discussion of De Wette in his *Beiträge*, I (1806), is still worth reading. Cf. also Wellhausen, *Prolegomena*; Driver, *Introduction*, and the articles in Hastings' *Bible Dictionary* and in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*.

show Israel's place among the nations of the earth, to show also that postexilic Israel is the legitimate descendant of old Israel. We have seen how much emphasis the community organised by Nehemiah laid upon purity of blood. Possibly even the more liberal party had learned the use of genealogy. That the genealogies on record were often fictitious agrees with what we observe in other ages.

If it was important to show that the Jews as a whole were of pure blood it was even more important to show this for the priests and Levites. Not only did they form a sort of aristocracy in the community; their right to take part in divine service (whose conformity to the divine Law was a *sine qua non* for the well-being of the nation) was based upon their blood. We can understand how important and how practical was this part of the work before us.

The historical part of the work, counting from the death of Saul to the end of Nehemiah's administration, falls into three almost equal parts. The first embraces the reigns of David and Solomon. The author had no really historical information except what is contained in our books of Samuel and Kings.¹ And in using these sources the author kept his main purpose steadily in view. With him history begins with David. Saul is left entirely out of view, for he was rejected and his kingdom was illegitimate. And in the history of David and Solomon much that does not bear on the main object is resolutely omitted. That main object is to show David and Solomon wholly devoted to the work of the Lord in building the Temple and organising its services. David spends his life in collecting the material for the sanctuary. He organises the Levites on the lines of the postexilic system. While yet in full strength he sets Solomon on the throne and hands over to him the plan and the materials for the Temple with a solemn charge for the completion of the great work. We are reminded of Ptolemy I. abdicating in favour of his son while still in full possession of his powers.²

¹ For the present purpose this is enough to say about the sources. The author probably had various documents at his hand not much older than his own time which had worked over the history in the same spirit by which he himself was moved. Cf. Kittel in the *Handkommentar*.

² This took place in 285 B. C. according to Mahaffy, *Greek Life and Thought*, p. 200. How far the Chronicler's picture differs from that of the earlier history need not be pointed out.

It would not be difficult for the Jewish student to read between the lines a comparison of his own kings with the Ptolemies in other respects—to the advantage of the former. If the kings of Egypt were religious in their way, David and Solomon were more religious in their way, with the advantage that theirs was the true way. Seen through the vista of the centuries David's prowess was more than Alexander's, and Solomon's wealth was greater than any upstart Greek dynasty could show. If the later kings were great builders, so was Solomon a great builder and a coloniser as well. Did he not settle Israelites in the cities given him by the Phœnicians and in the cities of Hamath? Did he not build Tadmor in the wilderness and other strongholds? And as for military preponderance, let the twelve great divisions of David's standing army answer, each containing twenty-four thousand men,¹ and these not foreign mercenaries ready to go over to an opponent if tempted by higher pay, but true sons of Israel each ready to shed the last drop of his blood for Yahweh and His anointed. Doubtless the resemblance and the contrast were in the mind of the historian. If he made his kings patrons of literature also, like the contemporary Ptolemies, he found tradition ready to his hand, for both David and Solomon were already counted authors of the first rank, with whom neither Ptolemy or Seleucid could vie.

In the second section of the history—from Solomon to the exile—there was much to pass over in silence. ² The revolt of Jeroboam was a revolt against the divine order. It was, in fact, so considered by the author of the book of Kings. To the Chronicler the effects were more far-reaching. By the revolt, as he regarded it, the ten tribes cut themselves off from the divinely ordered commonwealth. Judah alone now becomes the heir of the promises, and with Judah alone our history concerns itself. The fortunes of the larger half of the nation are resolutely cut out of the narrative. Even the heroic struggle of Elijah against the Tyrian Baal has no interest for our author. His only use for Elijah is in having him write a letter to rebuke one of the kings of Judah.³

¹ 1 Chron. 27. Solomon's 4,000 chariots (2 Chron. 9²⁵) belong in the same category, though here tradition had already invaded the earlier book of history.

² 2 Chron. 21¹²⁻²⁰. The theory of temporal punishment for sin is illustrated in the crassest manner in this passage.

The Chronicler's theory of history is writ large in all this narrative. The kings who conserve the institutions of the Law are rewarded with long life and prosperity. Those who depart from the Law are punished by invasion and calamity and their reigns are cut short. The prophets are always at hand to make plain the causal connexion of sin and misfortune, and the good kings themselves not infrequently ascend the pulpit and edify us by justifying the ways of God to men. Thus Abijah expounds to Jeroboam and his men the sin of which they had been guilty in throwing off their allegiance to David's house. The discourse is emphasised by a tremendous victory. Jehoshaphat encourages his men to trust in Yahweh and sets a choir of Levites before the army. The spiritual arm is mighty and the enemy is discomfited. That the hint given by the book of Kings concerning Hezekiah's reforms gives the author opportunity to make of this king a saint after his own heart does not surprise us; and that Manasseh's long reign is accounted for by an act of repentance does not move us more.

It is plain that we have here to do not with a history but with an argument. The Temple with its corps of officials is a wholly divine institution—this is the thesis which comes again and again to the front. After the organisation of the priesthood by David the sole purpose of the commonwealth is to keep the Temple and its services in honour. The Davidic dynasty was not necessary to this; when they were rejected, foreign kings took their place. To show this is the object of the third section of the work (now called by the names Ezra and Nehemiah). Here we find Gentile monarchs becoming nursing fathers of the theocracy. Cyrus gives command to rebuild the Temple and defrays the cost from the royal revenues. Darius rebukes the enemies of Israel and commands the work to go forward. Artaxerxes sends Ezra back to reintroduce the Law and clothes him with regal powers as well as makes a magnificent donation to the Temple. The same Artaxerxes gives Nehemiah authority to rebuild the walls, and to enforce the peculiar institutions of Judaism. That the greater part of this is not history we have had occasion to note. It should be doubly clear to us now that we see how completely the author is possessed by his ideal. And this is what pious and narrow men were dreaming when Greek art and Greek thought were making their way in western

Asia. They were holding on the more tenaciously to their own system the more it was threatened by another civilisation. They were perhaps reconciling themselves to the possibility that the Messiah was not to come for some time. In that case they consoled themselves with the thought that God could move Gentile kings to do all that was necessary for the support of the true religion.¹ All that the priestly caste really needed was to be protected in the exercise of their functions. And this protection they found, often at least, under Gentile kings.

But this protection could not always be counted upon, and when war or sedition came, the hope of a Son of David quickly revived. This is shown by an obscure document which we now find in the Book of the Twelve.² Its descriptions of what is going on in Jerusalem are no longer intelligible to us. But we are able to make out that the kingdoms of Syria and Egypt have taken the place of the ancient enemies of Israel. The writer begins by prophesying that Yahweh will take possession of the land of Syria and subdue to Himself the Philistine cities. Then the Messiah will come, but not with pomp and circumstance like the rulers of this world: "Rejoice, daughter of Zion! Shout, daughter of Jerusalem! Righteous and victorious is he; meek also and riding upon an ass, upon the foal of an ass. He shall cut off the chariot from Ephraim and the horse from Jerusalem; the warlike bow shall be destroyed and he shall speak peace to the nations, and shall rule from sea to sea and from the river to the ends of the land."³

These verses give the author's expectation. The rest of the prophecy shows the various ways in which the wished-for consummation is to be attained. The Messiah indeed is a prince of peace. But His reign can begin only after the defeat of the

¹ The Messianic hope is not prominent in the Chronicler's narrative. The only trace of it seems to be the promise that David's throne should be established for ever. The non-fulfilment of this promise may have been accounted for by the unfaithfulness of David's descendants. Probably the author, who is interested in the hierocracy, may have had the uneasy feeling that a new David would not be a comfortable man to get along with.

² Which we call the Minor Prophets. The passage is Zechariah, 9-14. The chapters are so near together in point of time that the question whether they are by a single author is of subordinate importance.

³ Zech. 9^{9f}. It is plain that this passage makes the Messiah's kingdom extend as far as Solomon's, but no farther.

Gentiles, and this is the work of Yahweh Himself. He will take Judah as His bow and Ephraim as His arrow and direct them against the enemy. The same thing is expressed in the figure that the sheep of Yahweh will become war-horses against the oppressive shepherds. The shepherds are the Gentile rulers of Israel. When they are trodden down, the scattered Sons of Israel will return to their own country and fill it so that even Gilead and Lebanon shall not suffice for them. This will be only after a time of trial and purification, but in the end the remnant will be the people of Yahweh and He will be their God.¹

A variation upon the same theme follows, showing all nations besieging Jerusalem. But Yahweh Himself will descend upon the Mount of Olives and make war against them. First, however, will come the extremity of suffering. The city will be taken and plundered—only half the people will escape and they will flee through the passage opened by the dividing of the Mount of Olives. This will be followed by the victory of Yahweh which will usher in His reign—a reign that will not be earthly in its character, for heat and cold and day and night will cease. Jerusalem will become the ecclesiastical centre of the earth, to which all nations will make pilgrimage. Those which refuse will be punished by the withholding of their rain—or if it be Egypt (which is not dependent on rain) then by some other plague. The ritual character of the city is indicated by the declaration that all the cooking vessels in the city will be consecrated to Yahweh, so that the multitude of worshippers may be able to use them for the festival sacrifice.²

The pious were still holding on to the Messianic hope, and the hope was beginning to take the fantastic shape of later apoca-

¹ The promise, 13⁷⁻⁹, seems the continuation of the discourse against the shepherds; see Nowack in his commentary (*Handkommentar*, 1897). It is unnecessary here to discuss the obscure passage concerning the three shepherds cut off in one month. It seems to refer to frequent changes in the high-priesthood under the Syrian rule, or perhaps in the change from Syria to Egypt and back again.

² Zech. 14^{30f.} This chapter seems to be an independent composition and differs somewhat from the rest of the book. Its statement that Jerusalem will be taken by the enemy before the deliverance comes may be the basis for later speculations concerning the Antichrist. The reputation into which the prophets had fallen is indicated by 13¹⁻⁷.

lyptic visions. The high-priestly régime was far from satisfying the requirements of those who clung most closely to the Law. This is what we learn from this part of the book of Zechariah. What the mind of the more rigidly pious Jews was toward the Gentiles is revealed to us by the striking polemic which we find in the book of Jonah. The little tract seems strangely out of place among the works of the ancient seers. It purports indeed to relate the adventures of one of them, in the endeavour to escape from the duty divinely laid upon him. But we easily discover that the narrative is a parable. The hateful world-power is presented to us under the figure of that Nineveh which was famous at one time as the capital of the world. That it will be destroyed is assumed to be the hope of Jews of the Jonah type. Therefore when the prophet is sent to announce the doom of the city, he flees—not from cowardice, but because he knows the merciful nature of Yahweh. If he announces the coming vengeance, the people will repent and then they will be spared. But this is not what he wants—he wants the hated world-power to be destroyed.

As he anticipated, so it turned out. Miraculously brought back from his flight, he witnessed the repentance of the great city. But not willing to give up his hope that it would be destroyed, he took up his station just outside the walls and watched for the threatened catastrophe. Angry at the patience of Yahweh, he was taught a lesson by the vine in whose shade he has rejoiced. Smitten by a worm, the vine withers and exposes the prophet to the hot Assyrian sun. As he laments over the death of the ephemeral plant the divine voice asks him: Should not God take pity on the hundred thousand innocent infants in Nineveh, not to speak of the cattle to whose charge no sin could be laid?

The man who could thus write was a bold man. Who ever rebuked the narrowness of the sect to which he belonged without incurring their suspicion or hatred? To the stricter Jews the Gentiles had become objects of hatred only. For them Jonah is intended to hold the mirror up to nature. The author of the book believed God to be the God of the Jews not only, but also of the Gentiles. This God has compassion on the works of His

¹At the present day it seems difficult to imagine anyone taking it for anything else. The embittered controversy over the historicity of the book may now be counted a thing of the past.

hands; even the heathen who repent of their sins find acceptance with Him. And Jonah may be something more than a type of that narrow exclusiveness which the author abhorred. It is possible that missionary ideas are here embodied. If Israel was in possession of the true religion, had it not a duty to perform in enlightening those who were deprived of this knowledge? Some such questions could not fail to be started by this little book. For the time being, however, it had no visible effect.

The Ptolemies were patrons of Greek literature. Philadelphus, the second of the line, was in accord with his father in the desire to make Alexandria a literary centre. The older king founded, and the younger fostered, the celebrated Museum and library which were counted among the wonders of the world. The direct influence of these institutions on the Jews of Palestine could not have been large. And yet they may have given some stimulus to the study of old Hebrew literature. Some such motive may be assumed at this time for the collection and preservation of the poems contained in the book called the Song of Songs, that is, the most perfect song. A Hebrew scholar, knowing of the boasted beauty of Greek erotic poetry, desired to show that his own country and language could show something as beautiful.

The Song of Songs is made up of lyrics whose common subject is the joy of the wedding time. For the week given over to the wedding festivities, the bride and groom are queen and king of their little village. They receive the homage of their friends in terms borrowed from the pomp of Solomon. They speak in these folk-songs, describing each other's charms or expressing the delights they find in each other's company. The frankness with which these charms and these delights are portrayed is not in accordance with modern taste. To judge the poems rightly, we must remember that it is wedded love which forms their subject. What we can appreciate is the love of nature which here reveals itself—a trait of the Hebrew temperament which we rarely find elsewhere. The intoxication of the newly wedded pair is enhanced by the fresh blooming of the flowers, the singing of the birds, the perfume of the opening spring. Such a book owes its place in the canon to a thorough misunderstanding. It

¹ The Museum was a school for critical and grammatical studies; see Mahaffy, *The Empire of the Ptolemies*, p. 91 ff.

was early interpreted as an expression of Yahweh's love for His people—Hosea's immortal parable had impressed itself on the thought of the scribes.¹ But while it is true that oriental mystics have often described their religious raptures in terms borrowed from sensual love, there is no evidence that the author or editor of these poems was one of their number.² While we are compelled to reject this interpretation, we may still be grateful that so charming a specimen of Hebrew literature has been preserved to us, and also that so human a document has found a place in our Bible.

Some of the poems which were later combined in our Book of Psalms doubtless originated in the period before us, but their consideration may properly come later, in the period in which the whole collection was put in circulation. More characteristic of the epoch we are now considering was the rise of what we call the Wisdom literature. This includes a group of books, part of which (Proverbs and Ecclesiastes) found a place in the Canon of Scripture, while a part (Sirach, Wisdom) was never so received by the Palestinian Jews—though their circulation among Greek-speaking Jews introduced them to the Church. Their common features are so striking that we cannot doubt their belonging to the same period.³ Fortunately we are able to date one of them approximately, and thus to locate the whole group, which belongs in or near the period now under discussion. The translator of ben Sira, who is the grandson of the author, expressly states that he came into Egypt in the thirty-eighth year of Ptolemy Euergetes. This must be the second Euergetes, because the first reigned but twenty-five years. This writer therefore came to Egypt in the year 132 B.C. We may assume that his grandfather's

¹ The parable was taken up and drawn out by Ezekiel (chapters 16 and 23), as we have noticed.

² The allegorical interpretation of the Song has now generally been given up by Protestant scholars. Until recently, however, the book was supposed to be dramatic in its structure—portraying the triumph of virtuous love over the seductive attempts of a royal suitor. This hypothesis is ably defended by Driver (*Introduction*, pp. 436-448). On the whole subject the reader may consult the recent commentaries by Siegfried (*Handkommentar*, 1898) and Budde (*Kurzer Handkommentar*, 1898), also Budde's article in the *New World* for 1894. An extended bibliography is given in the commentaries.

³ Three of them are ascribed to Solomon, the fourth bears the author's own name. Probably this was the reason why the last was not received by the Rabbis.

book was completed some years earlier.¹ As it contains no clear reference to the Maccabean struggle, we may date it before, but probably not much before, the year 170 B.C.

The work which thus claims our attention seems to show Greek influence—not so much in what it says as in what it implies. The translator begins by extolling the great things which have been handed down by the Law, the Prophets, and those who have followed them—"on account of which one must praise Israel for culture and wisdom." The language looks like a direct challenge to the boasted philosophy of the Greeks, as though to say that Israel has a superior culture derived from a more venerable tradition. The energy of the protest shows the extent to which thinking men were conscious of the Greek claim.

We shall wrong the author, however, if we suppose him interested in philosophy for its own sake. The Semitic mind has little use for merely speculative thinking. The wisdom, in reference to which the author reckons Israel no whit behind the very chiefest of the peoples, has little ambition to explain the origin of things or to bring the universe into a rational scheme. It feels deeply the practical problems of life and aims to aid in their solution. This wisdom, then, is the guide of life, guaranteed to lead its disciples into ways of righteousness and therefore into paths of peace. Its resemblance to the earliest teachings of Greek wise men easily impresses the reader.

This wisdom is to her devotees the subject of unbounded panegyric. By their imagination she is personified as a beautiful and majestic being—goddess the Jew could not call her—the constant friend, companion and counsellor of those who seek her.

" Wisdom instructs her sons ;
And warns those who attend to her.
Those who love her love life ;
And those who seek her early find acceptance.
Those who hold her fast attain honour ;
And abide in the blessing of Yahweh.

¹A discussion of the various theories about the book will be found in Kautzsch, *Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Test.* (1900), p. 235 f. (by Ryssel). The grammatical difficulty of the passage in the prologue on which all depends is relieved by parallels cited by Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, p. 255; cf. also Schürer, *Gesch. des Jüd. Volkes*,³ III, p. 159.

Those who serve her serve the Holy One ;
 And her lovers Yahweh loves.
 He who hearkens to her shall judge rightly ;
 And he who listens to her shall abide in her house."¹

This wisdom is not the possession of man alone. She is an attribute of God Himself. When the author exhorts her to utter her own praise, she declares that she came forth from the mouth of the Most High, that she has her throne in the heights, that she alone has circled the earth, and walked through the depths of the abyss.² It is evident that the personification has gone far toward making wisdom the supreme emanation from the God-head. But we soon see that cosmogonic speculation is far from the author's thought. For this wisdom, after visiting all the nations of the earth, has her abiding-place assigned her in Israel.

"Then the Creator of all things commanded me ;
 And my Maker gave me a home.
 And He said : In Jacob take up thy dwelling,
 And in Israel receive thy possession."

And after an extended panegyric of the delights of wisdom, the author adds:

"All this is the Book of the Covenant of the Most High,
 The Law which Moses commanded
 As a possession for the congregation of Jacob."³

This then is where we come out : the true wisdom had visited all the nations of the earth. But in none of them had she chosen to abide except in Israel. Here she had taken permanent form in the Law given by Moses. In Palestinian circles at least the pressure of Greek thought had driven men to take a firmer hold on the Law as the sufficient philosophy. By studying the Law and living according to it, all the practical problems of life are solved. It was perhaps with a view to discourage speculative discussion that an author of this school inserted into the book of Job a chapter in praise of wisdom which, though justly admired

¹ Ecclus. 4¹¹⁻¹⁵. I have followed the Hebrew text as given by Peters, *Der Jüngst Wiederaufgefundene Hebräische Text des Buches Ecclesiasticus* (1902). Similar panegyrics are found in 14²¹⁻²⁷, 15¹⁻⁸.

² *Ibid.*, 24¹⁻⁶.

³ *Ibid.*, 24⁸⁻²³. Read the whole passage.

for the beauty of its thought, is an evident intrusion in the composition of which it now forms a part.¹ In this chapter it is declared in effect that wisdom in the highest sense—the philosophy that would solve the problems of the universe—is the property of God alone. At the same time there is a wisdom for man, which consists in the fear of God—that is, in religion—and in departing from evil—that is, in a righteous life. Sirach would not formulate it in this way, but he would accept the general principle that speculation is useless. And he would go one step farther than the interpolator in declaring that God has in the Law communicated enough of the heavenly wisdom to serve man's need.

But if indeed the *philosophia ultima* is contained in the book of the Law, then the study and exposition of this book become of the first importance. And as one can study better under a master than by himself, the teacher becomes an important character in the community. Our author has a high opinion of the profession of scribe, as we shall have occasion to notice a little later. And to his mind the scribe is an ethical teacher. In his system little stress is laid upon liturgy, but much upon manners and morals. The boundary line between manners and morals is not more distinctly drawn here than is the case in most ancient systems. The result in the case of ben Sira is not unpleasing. His ideal includes patience, courage, modesty, kindness, temperance, chastity, and prudence. Particular cautions are given with reference to evil associates. Friendship is praised as one of the best of privileges. Intimacy with those in high station and with the wealthy is deprecated. Enjoyment of the good things of life is commended if only due moderation be observed.

With this ethical cosmopolitanism, however, the blood of the Israelite asserts itself in hatred of the old-time enemies—Philistines and Edomites—and of the new sectaries, “the foolish people that dwell in Shechem.” The present rule of the Gentiles is felt as a reproach; a prayer is uttered that it may come to an end and that the tribes of Jacob may again be set in their own land. There is no zeal, however; there are no fantastic dreams of a personal Messiah, coming in the clouds of heaven. No more is there any hope of a future life in our sense of the word; nor is there any hint of a resurrection. In the abode of the

¹ Job, 28.

departed none praise God.¹ All the more reason is there that men should repent in this life. The lot of men is apportioned by God according to justice and also with mercy. The problem which wrung the heart of the author of the book of Job seems not to give any more trouble. And yet our author stands on the ground of complete individualism—he believes that God deals with every man directly.

The roll of fame in which this book praises the great men of Israel omits the names of Ezra and of Daniel—a phenomenon of the utmost importance. To those names which we know from the earlier Scriptures it adds one, that of Simon the high-priest, apparently a contemporary of the author. This man, apparently a worthy head of the community, is praised for his care of the Temple. He is said to have strengthened the building and to have provided it with a reservoir. It has been plausibly conjectured that such works were undertaken in the time of Antiochus the Great, who, when he took possession of Syria, found it to his interest to conciliate the Jews. But of this we can have no certain knowledge.

The passage devoted to Simon gives us a vivid impression of the effect which the Temple worship must have had upon the faithful Jew. We read of the magnificent presence of the high-priest in his robes, accompanied by his train of inferior clergy. In solemn array they lay the wood upon the altar and the chief minister pours out the libation. The trumpets sound a mighty blast and the worshippers fall upon their faces and offer their supplications:

“Then the singers made melody with their voices,
And over the multitude sounded sweet harmony.
The people of the Most High uttered their prayers
In supplication before the All-pitying;
Until he ² had completed the service of Yahweh,
And had brought before Him that which was commanded.
Then he came down and lifted his hands
Over all the congregation of Israel,
And the blessing of Yahweh was on his lips
And in the name of Yahweh he made his boast.
Yet a second time they prostrated themselves
To receive the benediction from his lips.”³

¹ Ecclus. 17 ²⁷ f.

² Simon is here the subject.

³ Ecclus. 50 ¹⁸⁻²¹. The whole chapter is most interesting.

In possession of this imposing liturgy and confident that it had a perfect rule of life revealed in the Tora, Judaism was reconciling itself to the apparently insignificant place which it held in the economy of the world—is not consciousness of the favour of God more than worldly wealth and position? And yet the faithful must sometimes have found it hard to hold fast to their belief. Their lot was not an enviable one. Our author himself betrays that life had many anxieties. There were, first of all, dangers to personal security. Our author's prayer for protection says in so many words that his life had been endangered by slander—"an accusation to the king from an unrighteous tongue."¹ So serious was the situation that he despaired of life. In another passage he speaks of the frequent and dangerous journeys which he had undertaken. In the conflict between Syria and Egypt, the adherents of either kingdom might easily be in danger when the other party was in power. His grandson's final emigration to Egypt shows the necessity to which many Jews yielded in this period. Faithful to the Law and wandering over the face of the world—our author was a type of his race.

The book of Proverbs adds almost nothing to the picture drawn for us by the son of Sirach. The book differs from the one we have been considering in that it represents several stages of growth and in that it has a pseudonym at its head. The body of the work is a collection of maxims which remind us of Sirach and which may be called somewhat more primitive in tone, though the point of view is substantially the same.² This nucleus contains directions for a prudent life, based on the Law and ignoring speculation. The use of the name of Solomon must be judged as in the case of other books of the time. To show that the ancient kings of Israel were patrons of literature like the Ptolemies has already been seen to be one of the aims of the Jews in this period. This part of the book may be a century older than Ecclesiasticus. Some time after it was put into circulation it received as a preface the elaborate panegyric on wisdom which fills the first nine chapters of our text. This also reminds us of Sirach, though it is more elaborate. In it the personifica-

¹ Ecclus. 51². The whole chapter, which in tone reminds us of the Psalms, should be read. A prayer for the people is contained in 36 (33)¹⁻¹⁹.

² Prov. 10⁶—22¹⁵. The minor appendices to this collection, though interesting, give no additional light on the date.

tion of wisdom, even more distinctly than in Sirach, makes her an emanation of the divine :

“Yahweh formed me as the beginning of His creation,
 The first of His works in days of yore.
 From of old was I fashioned,
 In the beginning at the origin of the earth.
 When there were no depths I was brought forth,
 When there were no fountains of water.
 Before the mountains were planted,
 Before the hills was I brought forth ;
 When He had not made the earth
 Nor the first of the clods of the world.
 When He established the heavens, I was there,
 When He marked off the horizon on the face of the deep.
 Then I was at His side as a master workman ;
 I was His delight day by day,
 Sporting before Him at every time
 Rejoicing at the completion of His world.”¹

The advance in the thought as compared with Sirach (quoted above) is in the greater distinctness with which wisdom is affirmed to be the *Demiurge*—the executive officer of the supreme divinity. It is not possible to avoid seeing Greek influence here ; and that here is the germ of later Gnostic speculation, Jewish and Christian, is equally obvious. The writer, however, is far from the abstruse theology of a Philo. We have no reason to seek for allegories beneath his animated poetry. Monotheism is, of course, completely established. There is no longer a possibility of other gods coming into competition with Yahweh. Yahweh's character also is known. He is a God of justice. His reward is given to the righteous and it is given in this life. God deals with the individual ; each is responsible to Him. But reward and punishment are not looked for beyond this life. Sheol continues to be the obscure abode of the shades, a place in which there is no opportunity to praise God. The duties of life are justice, temperance, social righteousness. The cultus seems to be taken as a matter of course. There is no mention of the Messiah. In all these respects the marks of date seem to be the same that we find in Sirach.²

¹ Prov. 8²²⁻²⁷, 30 f. Slight changes in the text may be justified from the commentaries cited below.

² For this reason, as well as on linguistic grounds, recent scholars are pretty

We have no reason to doubt that the author we have been considering agreed with Sirach in making the Jewish Law the text-book of ethics. The wisdom of God was therein embodied for the instruction of men. The natural result of this exaltation of a book was the increased importance of the guild of scribes, and also the greater prominence of meetings for instruction in the life of the people. Some provision for making the Law known must have been made comparatively early. Deuteronomy commands that the Levites (though at long intervals) should read the Law to the people. This command was not carried out, so far as we know, before the exile. But in the time of Malachi we found an allusion to gatherings in which those who were in earnest in obeying God talked to each other of the things of religion. The Chronicler gives an account of a great assembly at which the Law was read by Ezra and expounded by the Levites. This is indeed an imaginative sketch, but it reflected an actual need of the people. As time went on the need became more pressing. The ancient language of Israel, in which the Law was written, was falling more and more into disuse. The Jews of Alexandria and other Hellenistic cities were learning Greek; the Jews of Palestine and the eastern provinces were adopting Aramaic. In this state of affairs new methods of making the Law known were called for. The result was the development of what is called the synagogue.

As religion is social in its working, it is very possible that the beginnings of the synagogue may go back to the time of the exile. We learn from Ezekiel that the people frequently came about him to hear his revelations. Such informal gatherings were not allowed to worship in the strict sense of the word—for worship, that is, sacrifice, could be offered only at Jerusalem. But prayer and the study of the Law could not be confined to a single place. After it was thoroughly understood that the Law was Israel's rule of life, the Sabbath was improved in reading and studying this rule. The synagogues were primarily Sabbath schools. But they also became places of worship, because the congregation united in prayer before the lesson, and in thanksgiving after it. An important part of the service was the oral

well agreed in putting the book in the Greek period. See Toy in the *International Critical Commentary*; Wildeboer in the *Kurzer Handkommentar* and Frankenberg in Nowack's *Handkommentar*.

exposition or exhortation delivered by one of the more competent members of the congregation. It does not seem strained to suppose that the books of Jesus ben Sira and Proverbs are the condensed results of a lifetime of such exhortation.

The importance of the synagogue was increased by the prominence given to city life in this period. In the composite city each nationality was allowed its own customs and a certain measure of autonomy. Even in towns where the Jews did not possess the full franchise they had recognised officers and courts chosen by themselves, administering the ancestral Law. The lines between civil and ecclesiastical life were not yet drawn; each community being both a religious and a political corporation. This put a tremendous power of discipline into the hands of the chief men. The Chronicler assumes that this power was exercised in the time of Ezra,¹ for we read of a resolution that if any one should not come to the public assembly (called to consider the question of foreign marriages) "his property should be devoted, and he himself should be separated from the congregation of the captivity." In representing this as the method in Ezra's time, the author no doubt lets his wish become the father of his thought. Even for the Chronicler's own time it is doubtful whether a popular assembly at Jerusalem could go so far as to sequester a man's property without the consent of the civil governor. But any community may withdraw its intercourse from an obnoxious member, and the extent to which this was actually done by the Jews is evidenced by the Samaritan schism.

The sum of the matter is this: During the period now under review the synagogue received its growth and became the centre of the social as well as of the religious life of the scattered Jewish communities. It possessed, at any rate, the power of excommunication, and in some instances it also inflicted civil pains and penalties. The importance of such an institution for the later history of Judaism needs no demonstration. As to dates we can only say that it seems to be fully developed before the Maccabean uprising.²

¹ Ezra, 10⁸, where the princes and elders are named as the administrative body.

² The whole subject is thoroughly discussed by Schürer, *Gesch. des Jüd. Volkes*,³ II., p. 427 ff. where a considerable literature is cited. The English translation of this work, made from the second German edition, gives

The guild of scribes was glorified by the Chronicler in the person of Ezra. It is interesting to notice the satisfaction with which ben Sira dwells upon this vocation when he compares it with other vocations or trades. In contrast with the husbandman or artificer, who is compelled to put all his thought upon sordid details, he who has leisure for study "will seek out the wisdom of the ancients." The object of his study is the Law of the Most High. He who devotes himself to this object shall not only serve before great men and appear before princes; he shall be called for in the public council, and shall be foremost in the congregation. The most natural interpretation of the language refers it to the opportunity of the preacher in the synagogue. What gave the order of scribes such prominence in the community was the teaching function which they exercised regularly for the benefit of the people.¹

The wisdom literature thus far considered, shows for the most part a complacent tone. The authors have disciplined themselves by study, and do not expect too much of life. Their ethical maxims give them a sufficient rule of life, and their faith in God and His Law serves as a working hypothesis of the universe. The world was not all they could wish it, but they were able to content themselves with tradition and the practical reason. There is in their utterances no evidence of internal conflict. But not all their contemporaries could rest within the limits which tradition and the practical reason fixed. This is startlingly brought home to us by the book which we call Ecclesiastes, and which calls itself Koheleth²—one of the most remarkable monuments of Hebrew literature. The author takes his stand on the tradition which makes Solomon the most prosperous and the wisest of

substantially the same material, II, 2, p. 44 ff. Cf. also Bousset, *Religion des Judentums im Neutestamentlichen Zeitalter* (1903), p. 149 ff. The inscription already alluded to shows that a Jewish "place of prayer" existed in the vicinity of Alexandria as early as 222 B.C. Other inscriptions from the Delta show that Jewish synagogues existed there as early as 150 B.C. Cf. Wilamowitz in the *Sitzungsberichte der Berliner Akademie*, 1902, p. 1093, and Willrich, *Juden und Griechen*, p. 151 ff.

¹ The praise of the scribe is contained in Ecclus. 38²⁴—39¹¹.

² The name has given the commentators much trouble. Its connexion with *Kahal* (*assembly or congregation*) is obvious, but more cannot be said with certainty. The reader may examine Cheyne, *Job and Solomon*, p. 298 f., which gives all that can be said on the subject.

kings. In the person of this king he will set forth the experience of humanity at its best. What is the result of this experience? Only weariness. The text of the book, which is also the result of all the author's thinking and all his observation is: All is nothingness! Absolute nothingness!

To prove this he recounts the experience of Solomon—under which we see his own experience thinly veiled. The first and most deadly thing in life is the eternal sameness of things. One generation follows another, the sun makes its round, the winds shift from one quarter to the other. But all this is only the rotation of a wheel, a continual grind without any real progress. A treadmill weariness lies over everything; there is nothing of which one can say that it is new. The former generations have perished, and their history is forgotten; so it shall be with those now on the stage, and with those that follow after, for ever.

But if it be said this is the conclusion of an observer who stands on the outside and does not get at the heart of things, we will go into personal experience. Let a Solomon with unbounded resources taste all the alleged sweets of life. He comes through it all to the same conclusion—the nothingness of it all, and the uselessness of exertion. The pleasures of the table, art and architecture, great public works, gardens, parks, a magnificent establishment, a harem of choice beauties—he has tried them all, and all are equally unable to give real satisfaction. Nor did intellectual pursuits—the supposed delights of study—give anything more: “I gave my mind to know wisdom and knowledge and madness and folly;”¹ I discovered that this also is a striving after wind. For in much wisdom is much vexation, and he that increases knowledge increases pain.” The reason of this is twofold. First, man cannot attain real knowledge. It is God's plan that all man's striving shall in this regard be fruitless.² In the second place, the wise man has no advantage from his wisdom; he lives no longer and he enjoys no more than the fool. One event happens to all. The wise man cannot even claim the poor advantage of a posthumous reputation, for all alike are in a little while forgotten.

¹ Things are known by their opposites. Hence he studied folly, so as to distinguish true wisdom.

² This is most distinctly expressed in Eccles. 8¹⁶f., but compare also 1¹⁸, just quoted.

The common opinion consoled itself with the thought that a man lives in his posterity. But this again is a delusion. How often do we see a wise man die and leave behind him a foolish son. Can there be consolation where there is such a possibility? Frequently enough we see a man toiling to gather wealth, denying himself the comforts of life, in order that his children may be provided for. But it is in itself an evil that a man should postpone his enjoyment of what he has earned until it is too late. All that is certain is that the recurrence of times and seasons will undo all that has been done.¹ The only good, if good we may call it, is that one should enjoy his little morsel while he may.

Epicureanism is doubtless the logical outcome of this reasoning, as is evident when we consider the next point. This is: The moral order of the world is not discoverable. The prevalence of injustice is notorious. Were justice done, the righteous and wicked would change places. We are reminded of Job's contention that the wicked are the ones who prosper. The common opinion piously consoles itself with the thought that God will surely judge. But this cannot be maintained (our author holds)—rather must we confess that God purposely lets injustice get the upper hand. His purpose is to show men that they are no better than the brutes. Who requires that the brutes shall be ruled with justice, so that the wolf shall be punished for his cruelty and the lamb rewarded for his meekness? Just as absurd would it be to insist that men should be treated on a different system. They are in the same class with the animals: "All go to one place; all are of dust and all return to dust. Who knows whether the spirit of man ascends, while the spirit of the brute goes below?"² The author here touches upon the theory of a future life only to reject it. His conclusion is that of the pessimist—death is better than life because it delivers one from the weariness and pain of the struggle for existence.

This pessimism is akin to that with which we are familiar in modern times. But the author is faithful to his Hebrew training in that he holds fast to the belief in God. This is perhaps easier to an oriental, to whom an absolute monarch is part of the constitution of things. God is the absolute ruler, and whatever

¹ This is the meaning of the passage about a time for everything, 3¹⁻⁹.

² Eccles. 3¹⁶⁻²¹. Verse 17 is evidently an interpolation, as is shown by Siegfried. As to the meaning of the passage there can be no doubt.

comes to pass is willed by Him. But what His motive is, or on what principles He rules His universe, is beyond man's comprehension. The acknowledgment of omnipotence as the leading divine attribute does not carry with it any recognition of justice or of love. The old covenant God of Israel has disappeared from view. We may say that the wider outlook has resulted in the practical shipwreck of the Jewish faith. The abstract belief that there is a God remains, but this is nothing in which the heart can rest.

A volume expressing these views could not find a place among the sacred books of the Hebrews without modification. And so we find that the book has been annotated by a disciple of the old school.¹ We may suppose the original author to have attained a reputation for wisdom, and that one of his pupils was so impressed by the value of his book that he thought to correct its errors by skilful insertions of his own. These insertions tone down the strong statements of the original writer or give them a turn less startling to the pious mind. Had not these additions been made, the reputation of Solomon would not have saved the book. With them included it may pass (and doubtless did pass) for the sage reflections of a penitent *roué*, such as Solomon was in popular tradition. Such a man might debate with himself on the problems of life, leaning now to one theory now to another, and as the book concludes with a strong exhortation to fear God and keep His commandments, its end was allowed to justify its eccentric means.

In the variety of voices which it lets us hear, the book of Ecclesiastes is almost a type of the period we have been discussing. The characteristic of the period is the confusion in the minds of men caused by the introduction of a new civilisation. We have seen that in some cases the result was a stouter affirmation of the old system. The insidious approaches of Hellenism caused the narrower Jews to shut themselves more closely within their exclusive system. Others responded to Gentile aggression by reviving the Messianic hope. But to the more reflective minds Greek thought started problems to which they were able to find

¹ It is impossible to suppose that the contradictory assertions found in our present book of Ecclesiastes are written by the same man. The true state of the case is brought out by Siegfried's commentary, which distinguishes the documents by the use of different type. The result is illuminating.

no adequate answer. Their speculative belief was indeed left untouched. It was not with them a question of many gods in place of the One. But what good did a philosophic theory of the oneness of God accomplish if the old feeling of Yahweh's covenant relation to Israel was gone? In multitudes of Jewish minds the result of this conflict must have been this practical scepticism. An observer of the course of history at this time might have anticipated the fading out of vital Jewish religion. Fortunately for the future of that religion, and for Christianity as well, the process was disturbed by violent political events. By these the contradictions which were beginning to sink out of sight were again forced into prominence, and an entirely new direction was given to the history of Judaism.

CHAPTER XIX

A NEW HEROIC AGE

ANTIOCHUS III, called the Great, obtained possession of Palestine by the battle of Paneas,¹ B.C. 198. In the years that followed he extended his empire over the other dependencies of Egypt and over the greater part of Asia Minor. These successes made him dream of reconquering the territory that had belonged to Alexander. But when he went so far as to invade Europe, he came into conflict with the Romans. This rising power inflicted a crushing defeat upon him in the year 190 B.C.² In consequence he was obliged to pay an enormous indemnity and to resign the greater part of his conquests. Syria was not directly affected. But the kingdom of the Seleucids was so weakened that its eastern provinces (always restive) found it easy to revolt. The kings of this line were from this time on almost constantly at war, while their need of money became chronic—both on account of these wars and because of the sums paid to the Romans. How their subjects were oppressed by the unceasing levies of taxes may be imagined. And in addition to the taxes the monarchs were compelled to resort to other devices. A favorite expedient was the plunder of some prominent temple. It was in an exploit of this kind that Antiochus the Great met his death.³

¹ The town which still bears the name Banias is at the extreme northern end of Palestine, at the foot of Hermon. The large fountain which made the place sacred is one of the sources of the Jordan. On the site, see G. A. Smith, *Historical Geography*,³ p. 473 ff., Schürer, *Geschichte des Jüd. Volkes*,³ II, p. 158 ff. The name in New Testament times was Cesarea Philippi.

² On the battle of Magnesia, cf. Mommsen, *Römische Geschichte*⁶, I, p. 748 (English translation, II, p. 271 f.).

³ According to Mommsen, *ibid.*, I, p. 750. There seems to be some confusion between Antiochus III and Antiochus IV. Both are said to have met their death in plundering a temple in Elymais. Cf. Polybius, XXXI, 11, and Josephus *Ant.*, XII, 9, 1.

Seleucus IV, who next came to the throne, does not especially concern this history. He was succeeded by his brother Antiochus IV (Epiphanes) in the year 175 B.C.¹ This monarch is described as one of those irresponsible and erratic characters who are not infrequently developed by the possession of power, and whose vagaries amuse, except when they distress, their subjects.² So far as our history is concerned, his personal character is not much in evidence. Almost any king of his line might have acted as he did in the same circumstances. A certain levity in his treatment of a grave problem distinguished him from his predecessors—this is all that we can say. Whether he acted on the conviction attributed to the philosopher by a modern historian, that all religions are equally false, we do not know. He at any rate forgot that to the statesman all are equally useful.

It was to be expected that the old quarrel between Egypt and Syria would break out again. Antiochus III had given his daughter Cleopatra in marriage to Ptolemy V (Epiphanes) and the Egyptians claimed that she was to receive Palestine as her dowry. The claim was resisted by Antiochus IV and war broke out in 173 B.C. Antiochus gained the advantage, invaded Egypt, and even besieged Alexandria.³ The king was called away by affairs of importance and did not obtain possession of the city. He went, however, to Jerusalem, where disorders had broken out. His real object was to raise money, and he had no scruples which would prevent his plundering the Temple of Yahweh, as he and his fathers had plundered other sanctuaries. We may suppose he made the disorders in the city an excuse for what he had already determined to do.

¹ On the chronology of the Seleucid period, cf. E. Meyer, *Forschungen zur alten Geschichte*, II, p. 460 f.; the dates are carefully reckoned by Schürer, *Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes*³, I, pp. 165–179.

² See the description of Antiochus quoted from Polybius by Schürer,³ I, p. 191 f. (English Transl., I, p. 199 f.).

³ As to the question between the parties, it is sometimes held that the *revenues* of the district were alone in dispute. But possession and revenue usually go together, and the endeavour to separate them here seems to arise from a desire to harmonise Josephus's story of Joseph the taxgatherer (*Ant.*, XII, 4) with the fact of Syrian supremacy in Palestine. But the story reproduced by Josephus is a romance of Samaritan origin; cf. Willrich, *Juden und Griechen*, p. 99.

The disorders in Jerusalem are easily explained. The old party divisions had become acute in the Syrian and Egyptian rivalry. The stricter party, which was opposed to the encroachments of Greek culture because it brought Greek religion—this party was apparently favourable to the Egyptian as compared with the Syrian rule. We may suppose that the Egyptians gave them a larger measure of liberty. The laxer party, who were already impressed by Greek culture, knew of Antiochus's desire to show himself the apostle of Hellenism and to bring his Jewish subjects out of their exclusiveness. It was only human nature to use this desire of his to further their own ambitions. The political head of the community was the high-priest—at this time Onias, a champion of the old order. Soon after his accession one Jason is said to have promised the king that if he (Jason) were made high-priest he would civilise the people and would also pay a larger tribute. Both promises appealed to the king and Jason was put in place of Onias. The new officer carried out his promise, first by erecting a gymnasium in which the people exercised after the Greek fashion. The new diversion became popular. Many even of the priests took their place in the arena. Some of the people even went so far as to obliterate their circumcision by a surgical operation, that they might in all things become Greeks.¹ What is meant by Jason's registering the inhabitants of Jerusalem among the citizens of Antioch is not altogether clear.²

All this was, of course, an abomination to the stricter party, and they were not likely to confine themselves to merely verbal expression of their views. The Hellenising party were equally unscrupulous in repelling force with force. Onias was obliged to flee the city and his adherents suffered with him. Egypt was the natural refuge for those who were compelled to emigrate, and the Jewish colony at Alexandria received large accessions in this period.

¹ The nakedness of the gymnasts was in itself an offence to strict Jewish feeling; and it exposed the tribal mark to ridicule. A sign of the increasing Hellenisation of the Jews is the number of Greek names that now appear in the history. The Jason mentioned above had changed his name from Joshua (or Jesus in our Greek texts).

² 2 Macc. 4⁹; cf. Schürer, *Geschichte des Jüd. Volkes*,³ II, p. 113, where evidence is given that the inhabitants of Ptolemais called themselves Antiochians.

To promise an increase of tribute is so easy a way of getting an office that we are not surprised to find it tried again. One Menelaus displaced Jason by the same method which Jason had used against Onias. It seems certain that Menelaus was not of the high-priestly family. Jason, on the other hand, is said to have been a brother of the Onias whom he displaced. One was not any more willing to give up the dearly bought office than the other had been.¹ After Menelaus had taken possession, and while Antiochus was busy in Egypt, Jason with a band of a thousand bravoes seized Jerusalem and shut Menelaus up in the citadel.²

It was on account of these tumults that Antiochus came to Jerusalem. His real object was attained in that he had a pretext for plundering the Temple of its treasures, including its costly furniture.³ The energetic protests of the people produced only a carnival of bloodshed.

This was only the prelude. Two years later Antiochus again invaded Egypt. But in the interval the Romans had taken cognisance of the state of affairs. The Senate had passed a decree for the defence of Egypt, and Gaius Popillius Laenas was appointed (with two others) to carry the decree to Egypt. The name of the Romans was a power in the East, and a son of Antiochus the Great had every reason to fear it. The uncivil but unmistakable injunction of Popillius was obeyed, and Antiochus withdrew from Egypt—in no pleasant frame of mind we may suppose. Whether he personally appeared at Jerusalem at this time may be doubted. But his animus against the Jews soon appeared. He resolved that the Temple should be made a place of Greek worship. A small Greek altar was erected on the altar of burnt-offering. The god to whom sacrifice was to be offered is apparently Zeus, of whom Antiochus supposed himself to be an incarnation. Divine honours had been claimed by the earlier

¹ I follow the tradition as given by 2 Maccabees and Josephus. But the reader must bear in mind that in this time of strife it is difficult to discover the actual course of events. Willrich (*Juden und Griechen*, p. 119) thinks that Jason was not high-priest at all but that Menelaus succeeded directly to Onias.

² 2 Macc. 5^{5f}.

³ 1 Macc. 1²¹⁻²⁴. The author mentions the golden incense altar, the candleabrum, the shewbread table, the censers, bowls and saucers, the curtain, the garlands and the decorations on the front of the Temple.

members of the Seleucid line in imitation of Alexander.¹ What was new in Antiochus's measures was the force brought to bear upon the recalcitrant.

Upon the new altar swine were sacrificed and the priests were obliged to eat of the sacrificial flesh. All inhabitants of Jerusalem were to conform to the new rites on pain of death. To prevent a revolt, the city walls were razed and a strong Syrian garrison was placed in the citadel.² To insure thorough work, a travelling commission was sent to all the towns of Judea in order to compel conformity to the new ordinances. Possession of books of the Law and observance of the Sabbath were punished with death. Mothers were executed for having circumcised their children. Greek altars were erected everywhere, and the heads of families were called upon to worship at them under penalty of death.

The measures adopted show that the king and his counsellors did not understand the Hebrew religion. No others of his subjects refused to adopt (at least outwardly) the cultus commanded by the king. The exclusiveness of the Hebrew faith was to the Greek mind of the day incomprehensible. It was interpreted as sheer obstinacy or as hatred of the human race. A Greek author recounts that Antiochus penetrated to the Most Holy chamber of the Temple; that there he found a statue of a long-bearded man riding upon an ass; that he supposed this statue to represent Moses who founded Jerusalem and gathered the people into it, and who gave them their misanthropic and vicious laws. The same author goes on to tell how the king, to show his hatred of such inhumanity, resolved to eradicate such customs; he therefore sprinkled the statue and the great altar with the blood of swine slain in sacrifice, sprinkled the sacred books with broth of swine's flesh, compelled priests and other Jews to eat of these sacrifices, and extinguished the ever-burning lamp of the

¹ Cheyne (*Encyclop. Biblica*, I, col. 23) supposes that a statue of Zeus was also erected in the Temple. But nothing is said of this in the Jewish account either of the desecration or of the rededication. On Antiochus' devotion to Zeus Olympios, see Nestle, *Marginalien*, p. 42, and in the *Zeitschr. für die Alttest. Wissensch.*, IV, p. 248.

² Winckler ingeniously supposes that the city was dedicated to Epiphanes and that it received the name Epiphaneia. For this, however, we have no historical evidence; see Schrader, *Keilinschriften und altes Testament*,³ p. 303.

Temple.¹ This account is an endeavour to defend the measures of Antiochus. It shows first the inability of the Greek mind to comprehend the imageless worship of the Jews. They were sure that the ancient fane must have some material object of worship, and the more grotesque they could make this, the better it would account for the Jews' denial of its existence. For the worshippers of such an idol to refuse to bow to the Olympian Zeus would be obstinacy indeed. On this theory the measures of Antiochus were justified—how else could the resistance of the barbarians to a beneficent reform be broken down?

From the point of view of the author of the persecution the measures taken were well chosen. These measures thoroughly polluted priests and people—that is, made them unfit for the service of Yahweh. If the divine choice of place could be nullified by human action, this was the way to nullify it. The altar erected in the sacred court was indeed a *desolating abomination*.² It drove Yahweh away and desecrated (deconsecrated) the place of His dwelling.

Experience shows that the sacredness of an ancient site cannot thus be destroyed. People who have a living faith in their God know that His will cannot permanently be thwarted by human action. But great distress of mind must have been caused (in the case before us) to many faithful worshippers of Yahweh. Some of these were ready to acknowledge that the desecration was an accomplished fact. They argued that the desecration itself showed that Yahweh had deserted His land and Temple, as He had done once before. What could the faithful do except flee from a land thus accursed? The high-priest Onias had been compelled to leave the country. He was the sole repository of sanctity and became the rallying point for exiled believers. In these circumstances it was easy for him to feel that he had the responsibility of providing a new centre of worship for his countrymen. We may therefore with some probability attribute to him the erection of a new Jewish Temple at Leontopolis in Egypt. Later Judaism was inclined to discredit this sanctuary

¹ Diodorus Siculus, Book xxxiv, quoted by Willrich, *Juden und Griechen*, p. 62.

² This curious phrase (Dan. 11³¹, 12¹¹, 1 Macc. 1⁵⁴) is a play upon the name *Lord of Heaven*; see the note of Nestle, *Zeitschr. f. d. Alttest. Wissensch.*, IV, p. 248.

and so its origin and history are veiled in obscurity.¹ But of Onias's good faith in the matter we need have no doubt. The temple and its services were probably modelled after the one at Jerusalem; it was surrounded with a heavy wall; it had a considerable staff of ministers. We know that it was frequented by the Jews for over two hundred years and that it accumulated a considerable treasure.² After the recovery and rededication of the Jerusalem sanctuary, an awkward situation arose for the devotees of the one in Egypt. But as they encouraged themselves by a prophecy attributed to Isaiah, they may have cherished the broader anticipations which are expressed in some other prophetic passages.³ If Malachi could say that a pure offering is brought to Yahweh even on heathen altars, it could hardly be wrong to worship at a sanctuary built for His worship, though outside of Jerusalem. But this faint attempt at a larger comprehension had no appreciable effect on later thought.

In Judea the situation was as desperate as can well be imagined. The walls were razed, the houses were burned, those inhabitants who showed signs of adhering to the ancestral religion were put to death. The new citadel was occupied by a garrison strong enough to quell any attempt at opposition. All that seemed left to the little company of faithful Jews was the opportunity to die for their faith. This opportunity many of them embraced with fervour. But not all were content with passive resist-

¹ Josephus has several references to this temple and it is impossible to accept them all as historical. In *Ant.*, XIII, 3, he takes occasion to discredit it by saying that it was built in a place full of animals sacred to the Egyptians (and therefore unclean to the Jews); and also that it was built upon the foundation of an old Egyptian temple. In one place (*Jewish War*, I, 1) this author ascribes the temple to Onias III (the one displaced by Jason), in another to an alleged Onias IV, son of Onias III. I have assumed that the former was correct, as the temple would most probably be projected during the time when the Jerusalem Temple was desecrated. Cf. Bähgen in *Zeitschr. f. d. Alttest. Wissensch.*, VI, p. 277 ff.; Willrich, *Juden und Griechen*, p. 126 ff.

² On the site, cf. Schürer, *Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes*,³ III, p. 97. If the builder of this temple were Onias III, the account of the high-priest's murder in 2 Macc. 4³⁶⁻³⁸ is incorrect. In fact, the account is full of improbabilities, as is shown by Willrich and Bähgen in the discussions cited above.

³ Isaiah 19¹⁸ is undoubtedly a late insertion in the text; but I cannot persuade myself that it was written on purpose to justify the Onias temple; cf. Chayne, *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah*, p. 99 ff.

ance. One day the king's commissioners came to Modein, a small place located in the edge of the hills just above Lydda.¹ The chief man of the village was Mattathias, a priest, a man advanced in years, and the father of five sons, all of whom had grown to manhood. Summoned by the royal officers to take the lead in the sacrifice, he refused; and when one of his neighbours consented to set the example, his righteous indignation broke out and he hewed the renegade upon the altar before which he stood. The outburst was directed against the unfaithful Jew, but when the overt act was committed it would be folly to pause or attempt a compromise. Mattathias, therefore, with his sons and kinsmen fell upon the Syrians and cut them to pieces. Thus was the standard of revolt definitely raised.

As we have had occasion to note more than once in the course of our history, Palestine is a country that offers facilities for guerilla warfare. The little band of rebels under Mattathias had no difficulty in finding temporary safety in the hills of Judea. Here they were joined by fugitives from other towns. A band of such fugitives was already wandering in the region. These, however, were so faithful to the Law that when attacked by the soldiers on the Sabbath they would not violate the sacred day by making resistance. They were therefore cut down to the last man, or rather to the last child, for women and children were with them. The report of what had taken place made Mattathias and his band reflect upon the relation of the Law to their necessity, and they resolved that they would not follow this unfortunate example; if attacked on the Sabbath they would defend themselves, though they would not take the offensive on that day.

The band obtained some successes, which gave them a reputation, and they were strengthened by the Chasidim—"every one who gave himself freely to the Law." The party thus named² is mentioned at a later period. It was composed of men who made the strict observance of the Law their first concern, and who, so long as this observance was not made impractic-

¹ On the site, cf. Schürer, *Gesch. des Jüdischen Volkes*,³ I, p. 201 f.; G. A. Smith, *Historical Geography*,³ p. 212. That Mattathias was a priest is doubted by some.

² 1 Macc. 2⁴²; our version gives the name in the form Assideans. But the Hebrew form Chasidim meets us in the Psalms; cf. Cheyne, *Origin and Religious Contents of the Psalter*, p. 56.

cable, were opposed to political action of any kind. They were driven to fight in the present exigency just because the observance of the Law was made impracticable. As soon as any civil power was found to allow them the exercise of their religion they ceased fighting. For the time being they added strength to the little band of rebels.

Strength comes by action and the outlaws soon became aggressive. They visited the towns which had been forcibly Hellenised, destroyed the heathen altars, punished the renegades, compelled the circumcision of children whose parents had been forced by the Syrians to leave them uncircumcised. In all this their quarrel was primarily with the unfaithful Jews, and, throughout, the enmity of the two Jewish parties for each other furnished the motive for the struggle. Mattathias, already an old man, did not long live to share the dangers of the contest. As he felt his end approaching he exhorted his followers to continued zeal for the Law. He advised that his son Simon be the leader because of his sound judgment, but that Judas¹ be the military chieftain because of his approved valour. It was evident that for the moment the heavier work fell upon Judas.

The Syrian government had no reason to suppose that the troublesome band was more than an ordinary troop of robbers. The officer in command in the district was one Apollonius.² Gathering what force was available, he marched out, intending to put an end to the insurrection. But Judas fell upon him, killed him and a large part of his soldiers and put the rest to flight. The booty of weapons was very welcome to the ill-armed Jews. Judas's share was the sword of Apollonius, which he carried from this time till his death.

The engagement was in itself of no great importance. But it encouraged the Jews, and they soon had opportunity to show that they were made of no common stuff. Seron, general of the army, called out all the forces of the province and marched into Judea. A pitched battle was fought on the ground where Israel

¹ Called the *Maccabee*, from whom the whole party receives the name Maccabeans. The origin and meaning of the name are obscure—the *Hammer* and the *Extinguisher* both have their advocates.

² Perhaps the tax-gatherer who had once deceived and plundered the Jerusalemites, 1 Macc. 1²⁹, 2 Macc. 5²⁴. His headquarters were in Samaria, 1 Macc. 3¹⁰.

had defeated its enemies in the old days,¹ and history repeated itself. The Syrians are said to have had eight hundred men slain. Things were evidently getting serious. Antiochus was about marching to the East, where also there was a serious outbreak and so could not meet the crisis in person, but he left orders with his prime minister, Lysias, to make thorough work in Judea.

The force at Lysias's disposal is said to have been forty thousand men. They marched down the coast under the command of three generals—Ptolemy, Nicanor, and Gorgias. When they encamped at Emmaus in the edge of the hill country,² they were joined by a large number of slave dealers who expected to buy the captives which should be taken by the soldiers. Judas and his followers assembled at Mizpah, which had served for a refuge in earlier times of distress.³ Here they fasted in sackcloth and ashes, wept, and implored the help of Yahweh. Before heaven they spread out the copies of the Law which the enemies had defiled by painting idolatrous symbols upon them; they pointed to the priestly garments which could no longer be used, and the Nazirites who could not complete their vows while the Temple was desecrated. Then the troops were reviewed in regular military order, and everything was got ready for the battle which was expected the next day. Just then the spies brought news that one of the generals, Gorgias, was marching with a flying column to a night attack. Judas took a quick resolve, and turned the tables on the enemy. With three thousand men he marched to the plain and attacked the main army, unsuspecting in its tents. The surprise was complete. The encampment was thrown into confusion, and after a brief resistance fled. Judas kept his men well in hand, so as to confront the detachment which had marched into the hills. These troops having searched the hills without result, came back weary and footsore only to find their own camp in possession of the enemy. In their dismay they scarcely made a stand before the impetuous attack of Judas, and their flight made his victory complete. An enormous booty was taken by the Jews, and the Syrian slain are by the Jewish writer reckoned at three thousand.

¹ At Beth-horon, 1 Macc. 3¹⁶; cf. Josh. 10^{10f.}

² On the location, see Schürer, *Geschichte des Jüd. Volkes*,³ II, p. 183.

³ In the days of Jeremiah, Jer. 40.

Thoroughly alarmed, Lysias now ordered out all the troops at his command and marched with them in person. The previous attempts had shown that the approach from the maritime plain to Judea gave the Jews an advantage, because the passes were easily defended by an inferior force. This time, therefore, a different route was chosen. The southern part of the hill country—the traditional territory of Judah—was now in the hands of the Edomites. They could be depended upon to assist the king's army against their hereditary enemies, the Jews. Lysias therefore marched down the plain till he reached this Edomite territory. Here he ascended the hills and turned northward toward Jerusalem. Advancing beyond Hebron the army camped at Beth-zur, an old stronghold of Judah.¹ Here Judas, whose forces had grown to ten thousand men, attacked them and inflicted such losses that Lysias thought it imprudent to continue the campaign. He therefore retired to Antioch to enlist more mercenaries, leaving Judas temporarily in possession of the district. In the three years which had elapsed since the profanation of the Temple the Jews had been uniformly successful, and nothing was now in the way of their asserting their title to Jerusalem. The citadel was indeed too strong for them to storm; but they were able to hold it in check, and to take possession of city and Temple.

We must now pause a moment in the narrative, to consider an interesting literary monument of just this period. This is the book of Daniel, which we see at once to be different in form from the prophetic books with which (in our version though not in the Hebrew) it is classed. It is, in fact, one of the books which we call apocalypses, of which we have one in each part of our Bible. We know also of others which have not been received into the Canon of Scripture. In these books the author writes under the name of some hero of antiquity. He transports himself in imagination to the alleged writer's time, and makes him see in vision that which is to come to pass. These visions simply clothe history in the form of prediction till they reach the time of the real author. They then change their tone and

¹ 2 Chron. 11⁷, where, however, the Chronicler transfers the state of things in his own day to the time of Rehoboam. The account in 1 Maccabees assumes that the territory south of Beth-zur was Edomite (Idumean) 1 Macc. 4²⁹.

set forth the expectation of divine interference in the history of the world—for these compositions look for the consummation of all things in the immediate future.

The best proof of this characterisation is the example given by the book of Daniel itself. The key to the book is the detailed description which fills its last three chapters. Here we have a vision in which Daniel receives from an angel an account of what is to come to pass. The starting-point is the third year of Cyrus, which means his third year as King of Babylon.¹ The author announces that after Cyrus three kings of Persia shall arise, after which shall come a mighty king—evidently Alexander the Great. The kingdom, however, will not pass to his heirs but will be divided into four. The fortunes of two of these divisions (Syria and Egypt) are then taken up. The author knows of the alliance cemented by the marriage of Berenice, daughter of Ptolemy Philadelphus, to Antiochus Theos. He also knows of the ill-success which followed this marriage and of the invasion of Syria by the next Ptolemy. Ten verses are given to the reign of Antiochus the Great, whose career made a deep impression in the East.² His successor, Seleucus Philopator, is dismissed with a single verse and then Antiochus Epiphanes comes into view. This monarch's seizure of the throne is alluded to and his two campaigns against Egypt are described. He is said to be checked by ships of Chittim, by which the Romans are intended. The author then goes on :

“And he shall be angry against the holy covenant and shall do his will and shall have regard to those who forsake the holy covenant. And forces sent by him shall prevail and shall defile the sanctuary, and they shall abolish the daily sacrifice and set up the Desolating Abomination. And he will seduce by flattery those who bring guilt upon the covenant people ; but a company that know their God shall be strong and shall act ; and the instructors of the people shall give understanding to many ; and they shall fall by sword and by fire, by captivity and by plunder for some days. And

¹ Dan. 10¹. The unfortunate division into chapters (and paragraphs in the Hebrew) makes 11¹ give another date. But the text is there corrupt ; cf. Bevan's commentary (1892).

² Dan. 11¹⁰⁻¹⁹. In v. 14 we have an indication that in the time of Antiochus the Great a party in Jerusalem attempted to set up the Messianic kingdom by force of arms.

when these are falling they shall be helped a little; and many shall attach themselves to them treacherously. And some of the instructors shall fall, in order to test them and to cleanse them and to make them white until the time of the end."¹

This passage reveals to us the inner thought of the Chasidim in the midst of the Maccabean movement. To them the desecration of the Temple was the first act in the great drama of the end. The birth-pangs of the Messianic age had already set in. But the main scenes of the drama were not to be displays of human power. The Maccabean uprising was regarded as only a trifling help; those who took part in it did not all belong to the strictest party and were counted as hypocrites. The believer's consolation was the thought that the death of the scribes was only a part of the purifying work which must go on a little longer.

What the faithful were looking for was a signal and direct intervention of God Himself. This seemed called for by the unparalleled wickedness of Antiochus. With a levity that the Hebrew mind could not comprehend, this king had abandoned the household god of the Seleucids and devoted himself to another and foreign divinity—nay, he even claimed divine honours for himself.² This would seem to fill the cup of his iniquities up to the brim.

On this ground we have the prediction which follows. In the immediate future the new era will dawn. Antiochus is to make one more invasion of Egypt and this country will come completely into his power. He will then return to Palestine and camp "between the sea and the mountains of holy beauty"—that is, in the Philistine plain, where his armies had so often been seen. But here he will meet complete destruction.

The conflict of the nations will be accompanied by a conflict between the heavenly powers. Michael, the patron angel of Israel, will defend the cause of truth. Great trouble may be expected to accompany these celestial conflicts, but at the end the true Israel—every one found written in the book of the divine approval—will be delivered. Then will come a resur-

¹ Dan. II 30-35.

² This seems to be the plain meaning of II 36—"he shall magnify himself above every god." Nestle points out that in the coins of Antiochus, Apollo (up to that time the patron deity of the Seleucids) gives place to Zeus Olympios.

rection of those who sleep; the martyrs for the truth who were not permitted to see the reward of their steadfastness will be raised to an eternal life. Those sinners and oppressors who were not punished for their misdeeds will be raised, in order to be condemned to a life of shame and misery. The teachers of the Law will then shine like the brightness of the firmament. All this will take place three years and a half after the desecration of the Temple by the foreign altar—therefore in the immediate future of the writer.¹

I have given this vision at some length because it furnishes the key to the rest of the book. For the other visions present us with the same theory of history. The succession of worldly monarchies, whether represented by the image seen by Nebuchadnezzar, or by the four beasts, or by only the ram and he-goat, culminates in the Greek empire, of which Antiochus is the last and most ungodly representative. He is the little horn which becomes great, exalts itself against the host of heaven, and even attacks the Most High.² But in each case we are shown that when at the height of his power he is to be overthrown—"without hands shall he be broken"—that is, by direct divine intervention. More dramatically his fate is shown in another passage where the judgment-seat is occupied by the Ancient of Days, the books are brought and the assizes are held.³ For his blasphemies the accused is found guilty, his empire is destroyed, and the supremacy is given to the people of the Most High.

It is interesting to note how the author came to fix upon three years and a half as the duration of the persecution. His whole calculation is set before us by himself. The books of the prophets were to him the repositories of heavenly secrets. In them he read that the captivity was to last seventy years. But he was only too certain that this prediction had not been literally fulfilled. Israel was still scattered among the nations; the

¹ The period of three years and a half seems clearly defined in 12⁷. The later data (1290 and 1335 days, 12^{11 f.}) are additions to the text. The 1150 days (2300 evenings and mornings) of 8¹⁴ indicate that the earlier expectation differed somewhat from the later.

² Dan. 8¹¹. Blasphemies against the God of Heaven are intended; cf. Moore in the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, XV (1896), p. 193 ff.

³ *Ibid.*, 7⁹⁻¹⁴. That the *one like a man* in this passage does not mean an individual Messiah seems certain.

promised glory of Jerusalem had not appeared, but something far different. By a course of reasoning which is not difficult for us to follow, he multiplied the original seventy by seven—perhaps on the basis of what he supposed to be indications of Scripture.¹ The seventy weeks of years thus given are divided into three periods. First comes a week of weeks, or jubilee period of forty-nine years, lasting from the fall of Jerusalem to the conquest of Babylon by Cyrus, or, more probably, to the installation of Joshua as high-priest. From this point the second main period of sixty-two weeks extends to what we may call the beginning of the end. The end itself covers the last seven years, which begin with the deposition of Onias. This period is divided into two halves—the first from the deposition of Onias, down to the desecration of the Temple by the heathen altar. The second half is the period of intensest persecution; when it has expired the promises are to be fulfilled.²

The unavoidable conclusion is that the author wrote during this period of intensest persecution and not long before the rededication of the Temple. We are now able to understand the stories of the first half of the book. That these stories have some historical or traditional basis is probable. But as they now stand they have been rewritten with the purpose of stimulating faith and steadfastness among those who were enduring the Antiochean persecution. Nebuchadrezzar or Belshazzar or Darius, each of these kings as he appears in the book, is simply the projection of Antiochus Epiphanes into an earlier time. Daniel in the king's palace refusing to eat the king's dainties because they are unclean is an example of what every Jew should do when tempted by threat or invitation to eat meat sacrificed to idols. The Nebuchadrezzar of the story erected a golden idol³ to which all people must render worship. The three young Jews gave a fine example of fidelity to conscience when they refused. So did Daniel when

¹ Bevan points to Lev. 26 ^{18, 21}, where Israel is threatened with a *seven-fold* punishment, and to v. ^{34 f.} where it is said the land shall keep her sabbaths. Combining these, the author supposed seventy sabbatical years (or periods) to be intended. See also 2 Chron. 36 ²¹.

² It is not surprising that the author's chronology is far from exact; see Schürer, *Gesch. des Jüd. Volkes*, ³ III., p. 189 f.

³ So did Antiochus, as is pointed out by Nestle, *Marginalien*, p. 35 f. We have no evidence that the real Nebuchadrezzar ever exercised compulsion in the matter of religion.

Darius forbade the exercise of his religion. The lesson of the stories is steadfastness under persecution.

And another lesson of these stories is the mutability of human affairs. The mightiest monarchs and the greatest empires are in the hands of God. He is able to overthrow them and to punish their iniquities. In one chapter we have Nebuchadrezzar, the ruler of the world, smitten with a brutish madness, and on his recovery acknowledging the unique power of the God of Heaven.¹ In another, Belshazzar when desecrating the sacred vessels by his orgies is suddenly hurled to destruction. The great dream which Daniel alone is able to expound shows how the kingdoms have succeeded one to the other, to give place at last to the rule of the people of the Most High. And in all this it is not human might or human wisdom that works. It is God who by His direct interposition pulls down one and sets up another, and compels the heathen rulers to acknowledge His power. This is the author's expectation for the future—not the courage of the Maccabees nor the revolt of the whole people will effect any substantial improvement. Until God intervenes, endurance is the best thing for the believer.

This programme of the Chasidim shows more distinctly than anything else the division in feeling among the people. The Maccabean party were ready to fight; the Chasidim would fight under strong provocation, but they had little confidence in the arm of flesh. One question must have given them trouble: Why had not God intervened before this? If God is really the unique and all-powerful ruler of the universe it is strange that He should allow such a state of things as we see in the universe about us—idolatry, crime, oppression. The problem is the old one considered by the book of Job and also by Ecclesiastes. The author of Job thought it insoluble. All that he affirms is that the Ruler of the universe has many great and varied interests in His charge, and that we can trust Him to manage them wisely, though He does not do it in the interest of what we call justice. The author of Ecclesiastes also finds the problem insoluble. In his view the

¹ Daniel, 4. The vagaries of Epiphanes probably gave rise to a rumour of his insanity. The description of the madness seems to go back to the strange Babylonian figure of Ea-bani. See the myth translated by Jensen in the *Keilinschr. Bibliothek*, VI, p. 12 (Pinches, in the *Proceedings of the Society of Bib. Arch.*, gives the name in the form Ea-du).

divine government makes no difference between man and animals. The piety of the Chasidim forbade them to adopt such an answer. Their solution is made known by some indications in the book of Daniel. Briefly, we may say that the blame for the present condition of things is laid upon the angels.

We saw in the time of the rebuilding of the Temple how the angels came into view as the organs of revelation and also as administrators of the divine government. Zechariah and his contemporaries conceived the universe to be organised on the plan of the Persian monarchy. The various provinces were under the government of angelic satraps, who had a considerable measure of autonomy. Angels were not unknown to the earlier Hebraism. The angel of Yahweh was the bearer of messages to the heroes of old.¹ But he had only a temporary commission and was reabsorbed in the divine essence or unmasked himself as Yahweh in person. But when the greatness of the world became better known, and when the thought of the people elevated Yahweh above all other beings, then His train of attendants became more important. In the large and loosely conglomerated kingdom of Syria it was easy for the governor of a province to disregard or evade commands of the supreme monarch. It was easy to lay upon these subordinates the blame for injustice and oppression. The viceroys were moved by their own desires or passions; they might even go so far as to make war upon each other in disregard of the king's peace.

It was not difficult to transfer this state of things to the world at large. The angelic viceroys might have selfish ends and pursue them for a time in disregard of the Sovereign's wishes. The book of Daniel assumes that this is the case. Gabriel is commissioned to bring a revelation to Daniel. The angel who presides over the destinies of Persia does not wish to have Daniel favoured in this way and forcibly restrains him. Michael, the viceroy of the Jewish people, comes to Gabriel's help so that he is able to deliver his message (though the delay amounts to three weeks), and after executing the commission he expects to encounter again the angel of Persia and the angel of Greece.

It is plain that if these angel viceroys are so bold as to oppose Gabriel on an errand to which he is directly commanded by

¹ The instances of Gideon and Manoah (Judg. 6¹¹, 13²) will occur to everyone.

God, they will not scruple to encourage their human clients to all sorts of violence against Israel. On the theory that they do so encourage them, the present condition of the world can be explained—though at the expense of the divine efficiency. The believer might be supposed to find small comfort in the thought that the heavenly rule is at loose ends like the Seleucid administration. But there is always in reserve the thought that this is only a temporary arrangement. The patience of Yahweh bears with misrule for the present age. Just ahead is another period of the world's history—the heavenly kingdom is already prepared in heaven.¹ Yahweh will shortly set it up upon the earth, will punish the unruly satraps, and will give His own people power over their enemies. It is plain that we have here not only encouragement for the time of persecution but the germ of doctrines which were more fully developed a little later.²

Because of the encouragement which it gave in the time of persecution, and perhaps because a partial fulfilment of its hopes seemed to come soon after its publication, the book of Daniel attained currency and credit at once. Because of the theory of history which it formulates, it has been one of the most influential books ever written. In every time of persecution its assertion that the world power now triumphant must soon give way to a better state of things, has appealed to the sufferers. Its expectation that the kingdom of God will shortly appear, has been renewed at every such period. This we see from Enoch and the New Testament Apocalypse, as well as from numerous other writings which have survived in whole or in part to our own time. The book of Daniel, moreover, gave form to the dualistic theory which has so widely prevailed in the Synagogue, as in the Church. Alexan-

¹ The stone cut out without hands (Dan. 2³⁴) prefigures the heavenly city of later apocalypses.

² How far Persian religion has influenced Jewish writers in this period is not yet clearly made out. It is plain that a principle of evil (like Ahriman) is not yet fully recognised. But these rebellious angel-satraps fall little short of the rebel angels of Enoch and of the New Testament. The reader may consult Stave, *Ueber den Einfluss des Parsismus auf das Judentum* (1898).

I have treated the book of Daniel as a unit. Even if composite, we cannot date its elements very far apart in point of time. Some evidences of compilation are pointed out by Barton, *Journal of Bib. Lit.*, XVII, pp 62-86.

der's career gave men the thought of a universal empire. But such an empire under a heathen ruler like Antiochus Epiphanes is the negation of all pious ideals. It is the kingdom of Satan. Hence we find the sharp opposition between the world and the Church, between the present age and the coming age, which passed from Judaism into Christian theology, and which received its classical expression in Augustine's treatise on the City of God. Nebuchadrezzar, or Alexander, or Antiochus, or Nero became in this theory the Antichrist, who in the last great struggle which is to usher in the kingdom of God, will be vanquished.¹ But we must now return to the Maccabean era.

The pious were willing to meet death at the hands of their persecutors in the hope that the kingdom of God was shortly to appear. The Maccabeans chose to serve God by active resistance to wrong—"with the high praises of God in their mouth, but a two-edged sword in their hand." And Yahweh certainly seemed to smile upon them. Success beyond human expectation had crowned their arms. The holy city was again theirs and they could restore their sanctuary to its legitimate uses. The restoration was taken in hand with scrupulous care. The Temple area was cleansed by the removal of everything that could suggest the intruded heathenism. A perplexity was encountered in dealing with the old altar of burnt-offering. Originally consecrated to Yahweh, it had been defiled by the erection of the altar of Zeus upon it. Did the old consecration persist even through the profanation? To be on the safe side, the workmen (priests alone were allowed to take part in the work) tore the altar down, but instead of casting out the stones they carefully laid them up on the Temple mount until a prophet should arise to tell what should be done with them.² The sentence is instructive. It shows the consciousness that prophetic inspiration was no longer granted. It shows also that questions of what was sacred and what profane had assumed a prominent place in people's thoughts.

¹ The influence of Alexander's career on subsequent ages is very marked, but cannot be further traced here. A considerable literature is in existence on the subject, the latest discussion being Kampers, *Alexander der Grosse und die Idee des Weltimperiums* (1901).

² Macc. 4⁴⁶. The author of Chronicles seems to have had no doubt that the vessels sent back by Cyrus were fit for sacred use.

All things having been set in order, the daily burnt-offering was resumed on the morning of the twenty-fifth day of the ninth month, 165 B.C. It was just three years after the beginning of the desecration. So important an event should be marked in some special way, and the popular assembly agreed that it should be commemorated yearly by a festival—the Feast of Dedication,¹ which has been observed by the Jews to the present time.

Success did not blind Judas to the difficulties of the situation. The citadel of Jerusalem was still in the hand of the enemy. As it was provisioned for a long time, and as Judas had no means of reducing fortifications, the most that could be done was to hold the garrison in check and to fortify the Temple as a balancing stronghold. Even then the hostile force constantly present was a reminder of Antiochus's claims and of the limitations of the Jews. Beth-zur, the frontier town toward Idumea, was strengthened, now that recent events had shown its importance. The Jews were, in fact, but a handful of people in the midst of a large hostile population. Hereditary enemies were the Idumeans on the south and the Samaritans on the north. In the Hellenised cities the Jews were looked upon with dislike. Frequent popular outbreaks against them attest this. And the conduct of the Jews when in power was not calculated to disarm hatred. It is not surprising, therefore, that from various quarters reports of persecution began to come to Jerusalem.

Judas was not the man to leave his kinsmen to the tender mercies of the wicked. War was carried first against the Idumeans, who were trespassers on the ancient territory of Judah. Their army suffered a severe defeat, one of their strongholds was taken, the tower was destroyed, and the garrison was exterminated.² A campaign against the Ammonites was equally successful. Then came a cry for help from Gilead, where the Jews were set upon by the Gentiles and obliged to take refuge in a fortress called Dathema. In Galilee, also, the Jews were hard pressed by bands from Ptolemais, Tyre, and Sidon, cities of

¹ The book called 2 Maccabees is a pamphlet intended to commend the observance of this feast and of Nicanor's Day to the Jews of Alexandria.

² 1 Macc. 5¹⁻⁵. The defeat was inflicted at Akrabattene, doubtless the *Pass of Akrabim* of the Old Testament. The fortress whose inhabitants were devoted after the Old Testament method is called Baian. The place is not yet identified, and it is not yet certain even that it was in Idumea.

strong Greek feeling. With the consent of the popular assembly at Jerusalem, Judas marched with eight thousand men to Gilead, while his brother Simon with three thousand went into Galilee. Both expeditions were successful. But instead of attempting to hold these regions, the two generals brought back with them the Jews who had been under persecution and settled them in Judea. For the present, the idea of setting up an extended kingdom must remain in abeyance.

That these successes were due in large measure to the courage and capacity of the leaders was soon manifest. While Judas was busy in Gilead and Simon in Galilee, the command in Judea devolved upon Joseph and Azarias, who had received strict orders to remain on the defensive. But ambitious of glory, these men disobeyed orders and marched against Jamnia in the Philistine territory. Gorgias was here in command, the same who had once been defeated by Judas. He now had his revenge, the Jews being defeated and leaving two thousand dead upon the field. The severe lesson was not lost upon the Jews, and they trusted the Maccabean brothers to lead them from this time on. Under their leadership further successes were obtained against Idumea and Philistia. The fortifications of Hebron were razed; Maresha¹ and Ashdod were captured. In the latter city, and probably in the others, the altars were destroyed and the statues of the gods were burned. Tolerance is not begotten of intolerance.

These various successes were obtained when the resources of the kingdom were employed elsewhere. Antiochus had gone to the far East and there had met his death.² He left a young son whom he commended to one of his generals named Philip. But Lysias, who was administrator at Antioch, without waiting for Philip's return, proclaimed the young Antiochus king and prepared to maintain himself as regent. Scarcely was the corona-

¹ 1 Macc. 5⁶⁵⁻⁶⁸. On the reading *Maresha*, see Schürer, *Geschichte des Jüd. Volkes*,³ I., p. 212. Schürer's sketch of the Maccabean uprising is an acknowledged masterpiece.

² It was natural for the Jewish writer (1 Macc. 6⁸⁻¹³) to attribute his death to the news he received of the recovery of the Temple by the Jews. 2 Macc., as is its wont, paints the end of the blasphemer in edifying colours; and Josephus is much outraged because Apion asserts that the king was smitten, not for sacrilege against Jerusalem, but for plundering a heathen temple.

tion over when an urgent message came from the Syrian garrison at Jerusalem: Judas was actively besieging the citadel, and there was fear that it could not long hold out.

The young king and his guardian responded quickly to the insult put upon them by the Jewish rebels, and resolved to crush the revolt by one decisive blow. An immense army was gathered, strong in cavalry, in which the Jews were notably deficient, and including thirty-two elephants. This arm of the service had been employed since the time of Alexander, but had not yet been used against the Jews. The invasion, like the preceding one, took place from the south. Beth-zur was besieged and Judas marched to its relief from Jerusalem. The armies met at Beth Zacharias, not far north of Beth-zur. The most desperate valour on the part of the Jews was unavailing. Eleazar, one of the Maccabean brothers, met his death in stabbing the elephant which he supposed to carry the young king. But the odds were too great. The defeat was decisive; active opposition in the field could no longer be thought of. The garrison of Beth-zur was obliged to surrender; the Syrian army marched to Jerusalem, and relieved the citadel. Judas was obliged to retire to the Temple, where he was in turn besieged. The garrison was in extremity owing to the lack of provisions,¹ when a new turn was given to affairs by events at Antioch.

The above-named Philip, appointed by Antiochus guardian of his son and administrator of the kingdom, was now approaching Antioch with the army of the East, and was prepared to claim his office. The anxiety of Lysias to retain his regency forced him to march against Philip at once. He therefore hastily made peace with the garrison of the Temple, promising the Jews freedom to observe their own religious customs. When he got possession of the place he thought it too strong, and therefore broke down the exterior walls. He did not otherwise interfere with the sacred building.

The concession which allowed the Jews to observe their own religious customs was one which if made earlier in the conflict would have secured complete submission to the central authority.

¹ It was the Sabbatical year, conscientious observance of which often brought the Jews into difficulty. The mention of this year as the Sabbatical year enables us to date the siege in 163 B.C.; see Schürer, *Geschichte des Jüd. Volkes*, I, p. 214.

But after the Jews had tasted the sweets of liberty they were not so easily satisfied. The straitest sect indeed (the Chasidim) now detached themselves from the revolution. They were content to live under any masters so long as they were allowed to observe their Law. But the Maccabeans and those most strongly attached to them distrusted the promises made by the young king. They knew also that the Hellenising Jews had heavy scores to pay off. Whether, in addition, Judas and his followers had large national aspirations cannot be decided with confidence. It would not be strange if they regarded their earlier successes as the pledge of something better yet to come. In view of all the circumstances Judas refused to be lulled into a false security and remained on guard. Events soon justified his precautions.

The Syrian throne had been designed by Seleucus IV (Philopator) for his son Demetrius. Antiochus Epiphanes had been able to usurp it because Demetrius had been sent to Rome as a hostage. Just at the time when Lysias succeeded in defeating Philip, his rival, this Demetrius escaped from Rome and landed in Syria. The troops received him with open arms and delivered Antiochus V and Lysias into his hands. Questions about the succession were settled (as was supposed) by the execution of the young Antiochus. Demetrius would not have been disposed to interfere with the settlement made at Jerusalem, had he not been appealed to by the Hellenising Jews. A certain Alkimus (Jakim was his Hebrew name) had aspirations for the high-priesthood. It is possible that he was in the direct line of succession; we have seen that the first Hellenistic influences in Jerusalem came from members of the family of Aaron. The Chasidim, as we know, recognised his legitimacy. At the court of Demetrius he complained of the persecution of the orthodox party and asked that a royal officer be appointed to investigate affairs in Palestine. In truth, the public peace was hardly likely to be kept while the Jews themselves were so divided. The Maccabeans regarded the Hellenisers as renegades, and were in turn looked down upon as outlaws and brigands. When the government had no adequate police force on the spot, we can imagine the aspect of affairs in Jerusalem.

The suggestion of Alkimus was adopted and Bacchides was sent to investigate. We can hardly blame him for not appreciating the piety of the Maccabeans, in whom he could see only dis-

turburs of the king's peace. But it was gratuitous cruelty—not only a crime but a blunder—to abuse those who were willing to submit to the royal will. The Chasidim were ready to receive Alkimus, recognising the legitimacy of his high-priestly blood. But he had no desire except to be representative of his party. Pretending to be friendly to the Chasidim, he got them into his power and put sixty of them to death in one day. Bacchides laid waste the country about Jerusalem, looting and murdering. After terrorising the people sufficiently, as he supposed, he returned to Antioch, leaving a force of soldiers under Alkimus's command.

Alkimus continued to take his revenge on the Chasidim, and the folly of his measures was soon evident. He actually drove everybody who would be faithful to his religion into the arms of Judas. Judas therefore soon became strong enough to take the offensive and to recompense the persecutors sevenfold into their bosom. It needs no demonstration that the seasoned warrior was more than a match for the tyrannical high-priest. Alkimus was obliged to appeal again to the central authority, and Nicanor, one of the generals who had fought under Gorgias, was sent to Jerusalem. An effort to get possession of Judas's person by treachery failed, and a skirmish resulted in a reverse for Nicanor. When the Syrian came to Jerusalem the priests showed their friendly disposition and pointed out the sacrifice they were offering for the king. But Nicanor's wrath against Judas included all Jews, no matter whether they were loyal or not. He broke out in scoffing and reviling and swore that if Judas was not delivered to him he would burn the Temple.

The threats were not carried out. Reinforcements having arrived from the king, Nicanor camped at Beth-horon, the scene of Israel's former victories. With a much inferior force,¹ Judas attacked from the northeast. The faith and valour of the Jews were again crowned with success, and Judas was able to rejoice over as complete a victory as any that he had yet attained. The arrogant Nicanor was among the slain, and his head and right hand were sent to Jerusalem in evidence of the victory. Nicanor's day became an annual festival and was celebrated till displaced or absorbed by Purim, which falls at the same season of the year.

¹ Three thousand men according to 1 Macc. 7⁴⁰.

The joy was of short duration. The resources of the kingdom, when fully drawn upon, were more than equal to the most desperate valour of the Jews. Only two months elapsed before the western division of the royal army appeared with Bacchides and Alkimus at its head. The impression made by this overwhelming force was so great that Judas's men deserted wholesale, leaving him only eight hundred out of three thousand. The few that remained advised against a battle. But Judas had so often opposed a superior force that he was willing to make one more attempt—or perhaps he was tired of the unending struggle and willing to end it. The desperate charge of his little band broke the right wing of the enemy. But the left wing closed in upon them, and though, surrounded as they were, they prolonged the obstinate contest till evening, the greater part were cut down. Among these was Judas. His brothers Simon and Jonathan, with a few followers, cut their way through the opposing ranks and brought their leader's body from the field. This they buried in the ancestral sepulchre at Modein amid the lamentations of the whole people.¹

Thus fell a man who deserves to be enrolled among the heroes of the nations. Trained in the hard school of experience, he became a soldier of the first rank. Again and again he gained victories in the face of overwhelming odds. With his whole heart he gave himself to the defence of his outraged and oppressed people. There is no evidence that ambition for himself ever entered his thoughts. He refused, indeed, to recognise a treaty into which the Chasidim entered. But this was because he had a well-grounded distrust of Syrian promises. If he had ambition, it was ambition for his people's liberties. His death was the fitting crown to nine years of incessant struggle for what men hold most dear.²

The death of Judas left the Maccabean party in as forlorn a situation as can well be imagined. They were completely in the power of the renegades, and these did not hesitate to feed fat their ancient grudges. As though heaven itself had turned

¹ 1 Macc. 9 1-22. The defeat of Nicanor and the death of Judas both fall within the first half of the year 161 B.C. The localities where they took place are not yet certainly identified.

² The account of Judas's alliance with the Romans (1 Macc. 8) is regarded with just suspicion. See Willrich, *Judaica*, p. 62 ff.

against them, a severe famine came upon the land. Bacchides ruthlessly searched out and executed the adherents of Judas. The author of 1 Maccabees, a sober and judicious historian, declares that no such extremity of persecution had come upon the faithful since the cessation of prophetic inspiration. A mere handful of desperate men clung to Jonathan as their leader and resolved to die with their weapons in their hands. It seemed as if this were all that they would be permitted to do. The land swarmed with enemies. From his headquarters at Tekoa in the Wilderness of Judea, Jonathan sent some of his possessions for safe keeping to the Nabateans, who alone were friendly. The train was under the command of John, another of the Maccabean brothers. On the way it was ambushed by the Bedawin¹ and cut in pieces. The vengeance taken upon an unsuspecting company of these same Bedawin a little later could not make good the loss of John. But the successful resistance made by the Maccabeans against Bacchides at the ford of the Jordan might be interpreted as a good omen.²

The Syrian general, having strengthened the fortified towns throughout the district, supposed that Judea was pacified and returned to Antioch. About the same time Alkimus was smitten with paralysis.³ His death made no difference in the policy of the Hellenisers who aimed at the extermination of their enemies. They invited Bacchides to fall unexpectedly upon the remnant of Maccabean adherents and wipe it out. The plan was betrayed to Jonathan, who, after inflicting some losses upon the invaders, fortified himself in one of the wilderness strongholds.⁴ Here when besieged he was so bold in sorties that the siege could not be carried on, and Bacchides, disgusted with the fruitless strife, turned against the Hellenisers, put some of them to death, and made peace with Jonathan. In the treaty he agreed not to make war upon Jonathan and agreed also to release the prisoners belonging to the orthodox party. He then returned to Antioch,

¹ The enemy came from Medeba, 1 Macc. 9³⁶, and are called *Ambri*, a name which occurs nowhere else.

² 1 Macc. 9³⁷⁻⁴⁹. Bacchides had crossed the Jordan in pursuit of Jonathan.

³ The orthodox regarded this as a punishment upon him for pulling down some of the Temple walls, 1 Macc. 9^{54f}.

⁴ Beth-basi, otherwise unknown.

leaving Jonathan practically master in Judea—for the Hellenising party were always dependent upon the king's soldiers.

Jonathan fixed his headquarters at Michmash—known to be a strong position as early as the time of Saul. Here he exercised the rights of *de facto* ruler: "He began to judge the people and to cut off the ungodly from Israel." The great majority of the people were on his side as against the Hellenisers. Jerusalem was, however, in the hands of the Syrians and there the Hellenisers were protected. Probably Jonathan had agreed not to attack the city when he entered into treaty with Bacchides. For about five years the double rule went on. But during all this time the power of Jonathan was increasing. Events in the other parts of the empire soon gave him unexpected prominence.

In the year 153 B.C. a claimant for the Syrian throne appeared in the person of Alexander Balas. This man was put forward by the King of Pergamum and was supported by Ptolemy VI. He claimed the throne on the ground that he was a son of Antiochus Epiphanes—which was false. But owing to the support of his two sponsors and owing also to the popular dissatisfaction with Demetrius he soon became a formidable rival to this prince. It became important to Demetrius to secure the support of his vassals. Among these Jonathan was distinguished for ability and courage. It was this state of affairs which gave Jonathan advantages never possessed by Judas. Jonathan had the tact to make the best use of these opportunities. The beginning was made in the same year in which Alexander Balas appeared (153 B. C.), in which year Demetrius made Jonathan high-priest and prince of the Jewish people.

We have seen that the high-priest was the civil as well as the religious head of the community. The embarrassment created by this combination of offices became evident at various points in the history. The Syrian king might—in the case of Mene-laüs he did—put into possession of the office a man whom the orthodox Jews could not recognise because he was not of the line of Aaron. During this period this party therefore regarded the high-priesthood as in abeyance. The result was to throw more power into the hands of the popular assembly. It was by the advice and consent of this assembly that Judas acted. He was never inducted into any official position in the commonwealth. The same was true of Jonathan up to the time when

he was appointed by Demetrius to the office left vacant since the death of Alkimus.

It is not the province of an Old Testament history to give an account of the wars, rebellions, and treacheries which came in the next few years. Jonathan showed as much ability in negotiation as he had shown in fighting. When he thought it to his interest he went over to Alexander. Under Demetrius II, who displaced Alexander, he increased his power and his territory. A new pretender made additional promises, until it was seen that Jonathan was becoming a danger to the very king whom he had helped to the throne. Trypho, prime minister of Antiochus VI, led an army into Palestine, but was able to do nothing against Jonathan. But his treacherous invitation to Jonathan to be his guest at Ptolemais was more successful. The Jewish leader came into the city with a bodyguard of a thousand men. The guard was cut down and Jonathan was seized. After some negotiation with Simon, the last of the Maccabean brothers, Trypho put his prisoner to death.

Simon succeeded to the high-priestly office, being formally elected by the popular assembly of the Jews apparently about the beginning of the year 142 B.C. He recognised Demetrius II as his monarch and obtained from him more extensive concessions than had yet been made to any Jewish leader. The Jews themselves regarded the accession of Simon as the beginning of their independence, and established this as the beginning of an era from which they henceforth dated their documents. The concessions of Demetrius were, however, on paper only. The actual power was in the hands of Trypho, who now murdered his ward, the young Antiochus VI, and proclaimed himself king. Simon proceeded to make his own the powers promised by Demetrius. The important fortified city of Gazera was besieged and taken, purged of its heathen emblems and abominations, and settled with Jewish colonists.¹ More important was the reduction of the citadel of Jerusalem, which had been held by a Syrian garrison since the beginning of the Maccabean troubles. The fortifica-

¹ The Philistine cities suffered severely in these wars. The Jewish hatred of idolatry is exemplified in the destruction of the ancient temple of Dagon at Ashdod. This building, with those who had sought refuge there, was burned by Jonathan, 1 Macc. 10⁸⁴. The life of Simon is recounted in 1 Macc. 13-16.

tions were too strong to be taken by assault, but the garrison was starved into surrender and allowed to march into Syria. The capitulation was a cause of great rejoicing to the Jews, as it made them complete masters of their own city. Simon not only garrisoned the citadel; he also rebuilt the fortifications of the Temple. He fixed his own residence in the immediate vicinity of the sacred building. This he could do without offence, since he was high-priest. His son John Hyrcanus was made commander of the important fortress of Gazera.

Simon distinguished himself by justice in the administration of internal affairs as well as by energy against the foes of Israel. The author of 1 Maccabees praises his rule as a time when peace and plenty prevailed :

“ He brought peace to the land
And Israel rejoiced greatly;
Each man sat under his own vine and fig-tree,
And no one made them afraid.
There was no one on earth who made war upon them,
And the kings were humbled in those days.
He lifted up the poor of his people ;
He was full of zeal for the Law
And cut off every renegade and sinner.
He beautified the Sanctuary
And multiplied the vessels of the Temple.”

CHAPTER XX

THE PRIEST-KINGS

THE supremacy of the Maccabean dynasty is marked by the decree which confirmed Simon in possession of the high-priesthood. This decree, which was engraved on a bronze tablet and set up in the Temple, was issued in the name of "the general assembly of the priests and people, the elders of the people and the dignitaries of the land."¹ It recited the benefits conferred upon the land by the Maccabean brothers, especially by Simon. It then declared that for these benefits Simon was to be their leader and high-priest for ever, *until a trustworthy prophet shall arise*. To him was given command of the army, control over public works, fortresses and munitions of war, and the oversight of the Temple. He was to issue decrees in his own name and had the right to wear purple and gold.

If we inquire wherein this decree added to the rights and dignities possessed by Simon's predecessors, we must remind ourselves that none of the Maccabean brothers had had more than an *ad interim* authority. To the high-priesthood they had no hereditary claim, and Jonathan's appointment to this office by the Syrian king could not make his title legitimate even in the eyes of his own adherents, much less in the eyes of the Chasidim. The latter party, as we have seen, preferred an Alkimus, hostile as he was to them, because he had hereditary rights. After the death of Alkimus no one seems to have come forward to claim the succession. The awkwardness of having no one to preside over the sacred rites was terminated by the recognition of Simon. It concerns the state that there be an end of litigation. The decree making Simon high-priest for ever was intended to settle the dignity in his family—*so far as human recognition could do this*. At the same time it was made evident that the popular assembly was not certain that it could do this; the settlement was made till a trustworthy prophet *shall arise*. Evidently the

¹ 1 Macc. 14²⁷⁻⁴⁹. The decree is dated in Simon's third year.

doctrinaire scribes were not satisfied. The popular assembly could not nullify the will of God as revealed in the Law. Doubtless there was room here for grave differences, and a later time brought forth severe strictures upon the family that without claim of blood had usurped the high-priestly office.¹

We can hardly be far wrong in ascribing to the reign of Simon the final redaction and publication of the book of Psalms. This is a collection of lyric poems of very different dates. That some of them belong in the Maccabean period is evident.² The process of redaction has here been a complicated one. There were a number of smaller collections made at different times for devotional use—books of private prayer we may call them. Some of the collections bore the name of David, perhaps under the influence which led the Chronicler to credit this king with the organisation of the Temple service.³ Zeal for the Temple service in the time of Simon led to the combination of all these manuals of devotion into one book. Some of the Psalms were composed for the Temple service, some were adapted to this service by being rewritten or expanded. The line which divides songs of personal experience from songs suitable for public worship is indeed not very sharply drawn. A psalm of personal experience may express emotions common to many believers. In a period of persecution the individual prayer is the prayer of the whole community.⁴

A prominent characteristic of the time in which many of the compositions were written is the sharp opposition of the parties in Israel. The writers represent themselves as oppressed by their arrogant neighbours. Sometimes these neighbours are heathen. But in many cases they are clearly Jews by blood who ought to follow the Law, but who have chosen the worldly part. It is the boast of the pious singer that he has not sat in the company of these scoffers, that he hates the assembly of the evildoers.

¹ The *Assumptio Mosis* expresses the views of this faction (chapter 6¹).

² The denial cannot be accounted for except on the ground of an unhistorical theory of the closing of the canon. The reader should examine Cheyne's Bampton Lectures on the *Origin and Growth of the Psalter* (1891).

³ The impossibility of the Psalms in the Davidic collection (1-41) being by David is pointed out by Driver, *Literature of the Old Testament*,⁶ p. 374 ff.

⁴ The question whether the *ego* of the Psalms is individual or collective has been much discussed; see for example Smend in the *Zeitschr. f. d. Alttest. Wissensch.*, VIII, pp. 49-147.

Yet these evildoers are often in intimate intercourse with the faithful, against whom they plot :

“Cruel witnesses rise up against me,
They ask me things of which I know nothing ;
They repay me evil for good.
But when they were ill I put on sackcloth,
I afflicted myself with fasting ;
With bowed head I prayed as if it were my brother,
As if mourning for my mother, I went in black.
Now they rejoice together over my calamity,
They utter slanders without end.”¹

It needs no argument to show the appropriateness of this language in the period we have been considering. And in this period also we can understand those Psalms which take up again the problem of the book of Job. The renegade Jews were often prospered ; the faithful suffered persecution, privation, even martyrdom ; was this according to the divine justice ? The reflections and exhortations of the Psalmists show how this question forced itself upon them. They have no answer for it except the confidence that things cannot long be so, that Yahweh will soon intervene for the deliverance of the righteous.² Prayer for this intervention is the object of many a Psalm. That the rescue of the pious means also the destruction of their enemies is plainly indicated, and the authors do not hesitate to imprecate those who take sides against the true God.

Few of the Psalms show a hope for the future life, in the Christian sense of the words. The hint in the book of Daniel concerning a resurrection has not reached the authors. They find in Sheol only the dark and shadowy abode of the dead ; the *manes* are deprived of the presence of God : “In death there is no remembrance of Thee ; in Sheol who can praise Thee ? ” The lesson which the wise man has to teach is only the old one that man being in honour abides not ; he is like the cattle that perish. Hence the passionate cry for deliverance from death which meets us so often. The sufferer dreads to go away from the presence of Yahweh into the dark world of shades.

And this presence of Yahweh which the worshipper enjoys is

¹ Ps. 35¹¹⁻¹⁵ ; cf. Pss. 41, 55. The difficulties in the text I have quoted are considerable, but I have given the sense.

² Cf. Pss. 37, 49, 52, 73.

His presence in the Temple. The persecutions and humiliations visited upon this place of the Presence have made it tenfold more dear. None of the Psalms are more vivid in their expression of emotion than those which praise Jerusalem, the joy of the whole earth. The lament of the exile draws its pathos from remembrance of those happier days, when he was permitted to walk in solemn procession to the House of Yahweh amid the shouts and thanksgivings of the pilgrim throng. Now far away from the sacred spot he is condemned to hear the scoff: "Where is thy God?" His comfort is the hope that he will yet be brought back to praise God in the place He has chosen.¹ In the pilgrim Psalms the authors express the fervour of their joy at being allowed to go up to Jerusalem—to Jerusalem the joy of the whole earth.

In proportion to this affection is the agony of the pious soul when the sacred city is desolated, as it was in the Antiochean persecution. In sad expostulation the Psalmist reminds his God that Israel had received the land by divine grace, and had relied on a continuance of that grace. Yet what had they experienced?

"Thou hast rejected and put us to shame,
And goest not forth with our armies;
Thou turnest us back before the enemy,
And those that hate us take the spoil.

Thou givest us to be devoured like sheep,
And scatterest us among the heathen.
Thou sellest Thy people for naught,
And dost not even name a price for them.

This all came upon us who have never forgotten Thee,
Nor have we betrayed Thy covenant.
Our heart did not turn away,
Nor did our footsteps leave Thy path."²

If in such circumstances the sorely tried believer cries out to God to wake and see the straits of His people, so in the time of relief he records the triumphs of Israel. Not always had Yahweh forgotten His people. In the convulsions of the Syrian kingdom, His people had not trusted Him in vain. He had been their refuge and stronghold. It was He who made wars to

¹ Pss. 42 and 43—originally one poem.

² Ps. 44; cf. 74 and 79, which speak of the desecration of the Temple.

cease, broke the bow, cut the spear in sunder, burned the war chariots with fire. These successes strengthened faith. The plans of God are indeed apprehended by faith alone. The unbeliever does not know, nor the brutish man understand them—the fool even says in his heart that there is no God. But the believer finds in the present experience of God's mercies a promise of that future when all His enemies shall be cut off.¹ And in view both of present successes and of future certainty, all creatures are called to join in praise of Him whose mercy endures for ever.

The piety which here expressed itself was a Bible piety. It nourished itself upon the Law and the Prophets, now the approved Word of God. As for the Law, the believer rejoiced to find in its multifarious precepts the method of showing his love to their Author. The first Psalm, written as a preface to the book, praises the man who walks in the Tora of Yahweh. And this is the keynote of the book. Occasional utterances which seem to depreciate ritual, as compared with moral, obedience are only echoes of words spoken by the prophets. They show a desire to attain spiritual obedience, but the authors are far from doubting the divine obligation of the Levitical system. The same man who in prophetic spirit refuses to rebuke Israel in the matter of sacrifices yet declares that thank-offerings do honour Yahweh. The longest Psalm in the collection is devoted to the praise of the Tora. With skilful, if somewhat artificial, method the author rings the changes on the words law, commandments, ordinances, precepts, instruction, warning, judgments, word—in each case meaning the Pentateuchal code with its rules and its exhortations.

And the other collection of sacred books—the Prophets—were studied as a book of fate. The author of Daniel had tried to read its secret. The fact that his date was wrong had not proved his expectation false. The postulates of Israel's faith compelled the conclusion that Yahweh must give the kingdom to His own people. To Him belongs the predicate *living*, in contrast with the gods of the heathen which are only dumb idols.² He is God

¹ Pss. 92, 93, 96, and others. Ps. 68 deserves especial mention as a vivid portrayal of the feelings of the pious in view of the Maccabean successes.

² Ps. 115. Parallel passages in Isaiah, 40, 44, and 46 will occur to every one.

of the whole earth. The wonders of earth, sea, and sky are His creation. And He is the judge of the whole earth. Even the angels who have abused the power He has committed to them will be called to account.¹ When the great assembly of the nations is held, Israel will be justified and the Gentiles will be condemned.

In fact, in the imagination of the writer, Israel has already been seated on Zion as the son of Yahweh. Against him the nations shall rage in vain. All God's people may claim a share in this kingly pre-eminence. In this faith one writer lays down the principles of the theocratic government:

“ My eye shall be upon the faithful ; he shall sit with me.
 He who walks in the right way shall serve me.
 He who exercises deceit shall not dwell in my house.
 Whoever speaks lies shall not remain in my presence.
 Daily will I root out the wicked in the land,
 And cut off from the city of Yahweh all workers of iniquity.”²

We can imagine one of the Maccabean princes adopting these resolutions as his programme, and in pursuance of them cutting off the Hellenisers who had wrought iniquity in the land.

But these Messianic expectations naturally implied a revival of the Davidic dynasty. The early Hasmoneans might be regarded as so many Davids, walking in his spirit and power. But as the dynasty continued, it failed to fulfil—any dynasty must fail to fulfil—the expectation of the idealist. And so we find hopes of a personal Messiah coming to the front. One Psalm describes the ideal king for us, another recounts the prophecies concerning David, with an expostulation against their non-fulfilment.³ These expectations were likely to issue in discontent and revolt. No civil ruler has ever satisfied ecclesiastical ideals.

But there can be no doubt that the situation under Simon was an advance on anything the faithful Jews had experienced since the time of Nehemiah. There was practical independence of foreign power ; the Temple was no longer in danger of desecration ; faithful observers of the Law were no more persecuted ;

¹ Pss. 58 and 82.

² Ps. 101^{6, 7}. The Messiah of Ps. 2 seems to be Israel, the nation.

³ Ps. 89²⁰⁻⁵², cf. 72 and 132. The priestly kingship, justified by the example of Melchizedek in Ps. 110, may be an attempt to sanction the position of the Maccabean princes.

they were, in fact, in favour with the government. Many unfortunates who had been sold into slavery were redeemed and brought home. Jews outside Palestine could again look to Jerusalem as their joy and pride. When they made their pilgrimage they found Jerusalem beautiful for situation, and the Temple services were administered in a manner worthy of the seat of the Great King.

The deep and earnest spiritual life which shows itself in the Psalms was attached (as we have seen) to the sacred books of the Law and the Prophets. The power of these books for good was extended at about this period by their translation into the Greek language. The Jewish colony at Alexandria had been increased in numbers during the Maccabean troubles. In the great centre of Greek culture the Jews were obliged to learn the Greek language. The generation that grew up in Greek surroundings had little use for Hebrew, which even in Palestine was becoming the language of the learned alone. Nothing was more natural than that the Law—the rule of life for every faithful Jew—should be put into a Greek dress. So far as we know, this was the first attempt to extend the influence of an important literary work by translation from one language to another.

Jewish tradition, which delighted to embellish history with the acts and monuments of Gentile kings, has invented a story designed to dignify the translation of the Law. One Aristeas is represented as writing an account of it to a friend. Both the writer and the receiver of the letter are intended to be Gentiles. Aristeas recounts that being an officer at the court of Ptolemy Philadelphus he heard the king inquire of his librarian, Demetrius Phalereus, concerning the progress of the great library under his charge. Demetrius, after giving the number of books at two hundred thousand, suggests to the king that the Jewish Law is worthy of a place in the collection. In answer to further inquiries he explains that it will be necessary to have the Law in translation. Moved by the suggestion the king sends Aristeas with another high official to the high-priest at Jerusalem. The letter with which they are intrusted asks that six competent men from each tribe be sent to make a translation of the Law from Hebrew into Greek. The writer takes occasion to describe the gifts interchanged by the king and the high-priest, and to set forth the glory of the Temple and its services. The mission is successful and the seventy-two interpreters come to Alexandria,

where they are lavishly entertained by the king and where they successfully execute their work. The newly made version of the Law is submitted to the Jewish community of Alexandria and is approved by them.

There are few cases where the falsity of a document is so evident as here. The only historical basis for the letter is the interest taken by Philadelphus in the Alexandrian library. All else is fiction pure and simple, and instructive only as showing the length to which a Jew would go to glorify his people and their institutions.¹ The document would hardly be worth mention except for the influence it has had on Christian views of the inspiration of the so-called Septuagint.

What we know about the matter may be put into a single sentence. The grandson of Jesus Sirach, who expressly tells us that he came into Egypt in the thirty-eighth year of Euergetes—which would be 132 B.C.—speaks of the Law, the Prophecies, and the other books as having already been translated. That his own translation was undertaken soon after coming into Egypt we do not know; nor need we date the translations of which he speaks, much before the time of his own writing. If we suppose the earliest efforts at translation to have been made about the year 150 B.C., we shall probably not be far out of the way.²

The translation of the Law was naturally of great importance for Jews. But it is difficult to think of any literary interest in such a work on the part of Greeks. It is impossible to think of a Greek approving such a jargon as we find in this version—a barbarous dialect which grew up among a people whose thought was Semitic in form, though they had learned a Greek vocabulary.

Nevertheless, the making of the version is one of the great events of history. Among the Jews of the Dispersion this book took a place of authority. The early Church adopted it as its Bible. Its prophecies confirmed men's faith in Jesus as the Messiah; its Psalms were the comfort of a new generation of

¹ The statements of the letter were refuted with great prolixity and learning by Hody, *De Bibliorum Textibus* (1705). As to the historic impossibilities, see Wendland's preface to his translation in Kautzsch, *Pseudepigraphen des Alten Test.*; Willrich, *Juden und Griechen*, p. 33 ff.

² Willrich, *Juden und Griechen*, p. 156. Schürer is inclined to an earlier date—the third century before Christ.

oppressed believers ; its histories furnished examples of fidelity and heroism when men were ready to faint under their burdens. Without the Greek version of the Old Testament, it is difficult to conceive the Church coming into existence at all.¹

The period of Simon was then one of importance for the internal history of Judaism. Externally it was one of promise and of prosperity. In 135 B.C., however, Antiochus VII (Sidetes) took a hostile attitude toward the Jewish ruler, and made heavy demands for arrears of tribute. The army of Antiochus, sent to enforce these demands, was defeated at Jamnia by a Jewish army under the command of Simon's sons, Judas and John. The occurrence was nevertheless ominous, because of the attitude of the Syrian king. Soon after the event Simon himself was assassinated by his son-in-law, Ptolemy. With him two sons were slain, and Ptolemy endeavoured to seize Jerusalem and the supreme power for himself. So soon had the vulgar ambition for power invaded a family which had stood for unselfish devotion to righteousness.

The first result of the murder was civil war. Ptolemy's attempt to seize the capital was frustrated by John Hyrcanus (Simon's third son) who was in command of Gazera. John was also able to possess himself of the greater part of the country, though his siege of Ptolemy's stronghold led to no result. The internal troubles of the country were soon overshadowed by an invasion conducted by Antiochus, whose siege of Jerusalem lasting a year brought the garrison to the verge of despair. According to Diodorus Siculus,² the king's boon companions advised him to make an end of the misanthropic people. But he contented himself with exacting the arrears of tribute and razing the walls of Jerusalem. Hyrcanus must have found the terms humiliating enough, but he did not have to wait long for his opportunity.

¹ The title *Septuagint* applied to a Greek version of the Old Testament, arose from the tradition of 70 or 72 translators. It has been suggested recently that 70 was the number of members in the Sanhedrin at Alexandria, under whose auspices the version of the Law was first published.

² Book XXXIV. I owe the citation to Willrich, *Juden und Griechen*, p. 61 f. The statement that Hyrcanus plundered the tomb of David of its treasures in order to pay the exactions need not be taken seriously (Josephus, *Ant.*, VII, 15, 3). On the theory that the Romans intervened in favour of the Jews, see Schürer, *Gesch. d. Jüd. Volkes*,³ I, p. 261 f.

Antiochus was called to the East by the customary revolt of his provinces and met his death in battle against the Parthians (129 B.C.). Hyrcanus accompanied him on this campaign but was not involved in the catastrophe. The weak Demetrius II was not able to enforce any claims against the Jews, and Hyrcanus saw his advantage. With an energy that reminds us of the best of his predecessors, he moved to regain the territory that had belonged to his father and in the process took revenge on the hereditary enemies of Israel—the Samaritans. The schismatic Temple on Gerizim was destroyed. Even more important for future history was the conquest of the Idumeans, who were compelled to submit to the rite of circumcision and thus to become a part of the Jewish body politic. Hyrcanus made a new departure in the policy of his house, moreover, by enlisting mercenaries in his army instead of carrying on his wars by citizens of the commonwealth. Continued strife of pretenders to the Syrian throne allowed him to carry out his plans without serious opposition. The weakness of the crown is attested by the fact that the new Antiochus was appealed to by the Samaritans to help them in the siege, but was able to accomplish nothing against the Jewish army.

The reign of John Hyrcanus brought into prominence the two tendencies which had existed among the Jews since the time of Jonathan. The old Hellenists had disappeared. All the subjects of Hyrcanus were, externally at least, devoted to the ancestral religion, worshipped none but Yahweh, and desired the administration of none but the Mosaic rites. But, as we saw during the Maccabean struggle, there were degrees of devotion. The Chasidim had always emphasised the observance of the Law from the religious point of view—the whole duty of man was to obey the will of God as laid down in His Book. When they were allowed to follow this principle, they withdrew from the struggle for Jewish liberty. They thought it no part of their duty to establish the kingdom—God would establish it by His direct intervention when the time should come. Because of this withdrawal, or because they held aloof from the common people, they received the name Pharisees or Separatists.¹ Since their whole strength was given to the study and observance of the Law, they regarded

¹ *Perushim* is the Hebrew form. On this whole subject, see Wellhausen, *Pharisäer und Sadducäer* (1874).

themselves as the rightful leaders and teachers of the people. And the people for the most part conceded the claim. Obedience to the six hundred and thirteen precepts requires serious study, and the exposition of what is commanded or forbidden is the work of professionals.

It was inevitable that this party should become the critics of the Maccabean dynasty as soon as it was settled at the head of affairs. Practical politics cannot take account of the subtleties of theoretical jurisprudence, especially when this jurisprudence is built up on an ecclesiastical theory. This became evident in the reign of John Hyrcanus, if it was not evident before. John was minded to govern according to the Tora and to give heed to its Pharisaic expositors. According to Josephus, he invited their leaders to a feast and avowed his adhesion to them saying "that he was desirous to be a righteous man and to do all things whereby he might please God"—which (Josephus adds) was the very profession of the Pharisees.¹ The majority of those present testified to the prince's acceptability. But one Eleazar demanded that he lay down the high-priesthood because his mother had at one time been a slave.

The consistency of the interlocutor is evident. The high-priest's purity of blood must be above suspicion. The servitude of the mother, however unwilling, made her incapable of insuring the ingenuousness of her son. Hence the demand that he resign his office. Whether the allegation concerning the mother's slavery was true does not especially concern us—Josephus says that it was false. In any case here was a theorist who would oust a whole family from office because of a suspicion. That Hyrcanus was angry we may well believe. What embittered him most was that the whole party seemed to defend their rash colleague. On this account he broke with them and threw himself into the arms of the Sadducees.

By this name we designate the party of practical men who had identified themselves with the fortunes of the Maccabean house. These men were devoted to the Law, so far as this was compatible with their plans to secure Israel's political independence. They were the party of the priestly aristocracy and probably took their name from that Zadok, whose exclusive right to the priestly offices had been asserted by Ezekiel. The Sadducees were in

¹ *Ant.*, XIII, 10, 5; cf. Grätz, *Geschichte der Juden*, ³ III, p. 128.

some respects more conservative than the Pharisees, not recognising those casuistical interpretations which the latter party regarded as equally binding with the Law itself. That they rejected the doctrine of the resurrection, as we learn from the New Testament, is doubtless explained by the fact that they did not find it taught in the Law.

In speaking of the prominence of the city in the Greek period we conjectured that this prominence had something to do with the rise of the Sanhedrin. The reader will have noticed that in the Maccabean period we hear frequently of the Council or Senate of the Jews. Under this body Judas Maccabeus acted, and Simon received from it a confirmation of the power conferred by the king of Syria. Some sort of council of notables had existed in Israel from early times. One of the Pentateuchal editors imagined such a body active in the Mosaic age.¹ The Chronicler tells us that Jehoshaphat organized a court at Jerusalem, the members of which were priests, Levites, and the heads of families. Nehemiah found such a body in existence in Jerusalem.² These indications are sufficient to show that in the Chronicler's time there existed a supreme court in Jerusalem. As the line which divides judicial from administrative functions was not sharply drawn in early times we can see how this court grew in importance, especially in the Maccabean period. When the office of high-priest was vacant, and when the country was in revolt against the king of Syria, this court was the only organ of government to which men could appeal. Judas Maccabeus never claimed to rule, and he was glad to act as the appointee of what 1 Macc. calls (not without reason) the "Senate" of the Jews. During the time of stress, however, the membership of the body must have changed. The Hellenising nobles could not remain in the midst of a population hostile to all innovations. As they were banished, were executed or emigrated, new members would come in, men more in accord with the popular will. It is fair to say therefore that in this period the Sanhedrin (the word is Greek) became democratic, whereas it had been aristocratic. The details of the process escape us, but we know that in New Testament times the most influential members of the body belonged to the guild of scribes, and that the scribes were from both

¹ Num. 11, 16^f. The verses are assigned to a late stratum of E.

² Neh. 2 16^f. 2 Chron. 19⁸.

parties—Sadducees and Pharisees.¹ The animation of their debates, which not infrequently proceeded from words to blows, may be imagined.

John Hyrcanus had a successful reign of thirty years, dying in 104 B.C. The extent to which vulgar ambition had made its way into the Maccabean family came to light after his death. The administration of affairs was left to his wife, while the high-priesthood, which could not be held by a woman, was assigned to Aristobulus, his oldest son. But Aristobulus had no notion of a merely ecclesiastical jurisdiction. He seized the supreme power, put his mother in prison, where she died of starvation, and kept three of his brothers in bonds. His relations with the other brother, Antigonus, were friendly; but evil-minded persons found opportunity to sow discord between them, and Antigonus was cut down by the bodyguard. The people's abhorrence of the fratricide is manifested by the legends which arose concerning the event and the prodigies which preceded it,² as also concerning the illness of Aristobulus which soon followed. In the single year of his reign this prince took to himself the title of king, something which the Maccabean rulers had not yet ventured to do. That he favoured the Sadducean party seems evident, for he is said to have conducted himself as a Philhellene—a charge easily brought by the Pharisees against their opponents. During his reign the territory subject to Jerusalem was enlarged by the addition of Galilee, whose inhabitants were compelled to adopt Jewish customs, including circumcision.

Aristobulus was succeeded by Alexander Jannæus, one of the brothers whom he had kept in prison.³ He carried out the policy of his father and brother in favouring the Sadducean party. For this reason he was hated by the Pharisees. His reign was a miserable period of external and internal warfare. The rule of the Maccabees had become a despotism of the common oriental

¹ The subject is treated by Schürer, *Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes*, ³ II, pp. 188-214, where an extended bibliography is given. The testimony of Josephus (*Ant.* XII, 3, 3) concerning the times of Antiochus the Great must be received with caution, but the references of 1 Macc. to the "Senate" of the Jews are above suspicion.

² Josephus, *Ant.*, XIII, 11, 2 f.; *Bellum Jud.*, I, 3.

³ The power fell at first into the hands of Aristobulus's wife Alexandra, who released Alexander and raised him to the throne, giving him also her hand.

sort. The king sustained himself by a force of mercenaries, and those subjects who opposed him were treated with the utmost cruelty. They on their part sought help from the moribund Syrian kingdom, so that the reign of Jannæus may be called anarchy rather than the theocracy which it pretended to be.

The details of Alexander's reign (103-76 B.C.) may be read in Josephus. From about this period, however, some literary monuments have come down to us, to which we must give a moment's attention. One of these is the first book of Maccabees, upon which we have drawn so largely for our history of the great struggle for independence. The book¹ is a dignified and eloquent defence of the Maccabean dynasty in the best form which such a defence could take—a plain and for the most part accurate account of its rise to power. It may be called the manifesto of the Sadducean party.

Very different is the tone of the remarkable book which was circulated among the Pharisaic section of the people at about this time—the book of Enoch.² Various motives combined in the literature which circulated under the name of this antediluvian patriarch. One was undoubtedly the desire to trace science to ancient revelation. So we have Enoch, who was admitted to the secrets of heaven, expounding the method in which the heavenly bodies perform their work.

But this is only a subordinate interest. The chief purpose of the school who wrote this literature is to develop a religious theory of the universe, and so to justify the ways of God to men. It takes up the thoughts of the book of Daniel, and carries them to their legitimate conclusion. The Ancient of Days again sits on a throne, and by his side the Son of Man who will thrust down the mighty from their seats of power. This Son of Man, however, is not the nation Israel, but a personal Messiah, the possessor of righteousness and the revealer of the treasures of wisdom.

¹ This refers to the main stock of the book, chapters 1¹-14¹⁵. The rest seems somewhat later in date.

² On the editions and versions, cf. Schürer, *Gesch. des Jüd. Volkes*,³ III, p. 207 f. (English translation, II, 3, p. 54 ff.) The latest English translation is by Charles, *The Book of Enoch* (1893); one in German by Beer is published in Kautzsch, *Pseudepigraphen des alten Testaments*. The book of Enoch, as we have it, contains additions made somewhat later than the period we are now studying.

He is already in existence in heaven, having been created before the stars, "chosen and treasured before Him before the world was made." In the day in which He shall be revealed, the earth will give up those who are buried in it, Hades and the Abyss will give up their dead. After this resurrection will come the Judgment, and then the righteous will become like the angels.

The advance over the partial resurrection taught in Daniel must be evident. And so is the advance in another particular. In Daniel the angels who rule over the nations are hostile to Israel. Enoch makes them worse, and in developing his theory he goes back to the story of the sons of God in Genesis. Two hundred of these (it is now said) conspired and took wives from among men. They taught these wives the secrets of sorcery. For this and for the violence of their sons, the giants, they were, at God's command, confined in dungeons under the earth till the great Judgment, after which they will be cast into Gehenna. Enoch is introduced as the herald divinely commissioned to announce their fate to these rebellious angels, and he is shown the place of their punishment. He also sees the divisions in Sheol—one the provisional Paradise of the faithful, another the temporary place of confinement for those who are later to be condemned to Gehenna, the third for those who do not attain to the resurrection of the righteous, but who are not wicked enough to deserve the deeper damnation of Gehenna.

This literature made various attempts to determine the time of the Messianic deliverance. We find one statement that the history of the world will run its course in ten periods, of which seven have passed. The remaining three are to show successive stages of the triumph of righteousness. The writer regards his own time as one of degeneracy. More elaborate is the vision in which the history of the world is set forth as a conflict of the animals.¹ The most interesting part relates that, from the Assyrian period on, God gave His sheep (Israel) into the hands of seventy shepherds. At the same time, foreseeing that the shepherds would exceed the instructions given them, He appointed a recorder to watch their conduct. These shepherds represent the guardian angels of the heathen nations—in this case also a hint of Daniel's

¹ Enoch, 83-90. The great horn in chapter 90, which is identified by some with Judas Maccabeus, and by others with John Hyrcanus, does not fully correspond with either.

has been expanded. These angels of the nations have prompted the persecution of the Jews. In the great Day which is approaching they, as well as those other angels which kept not their first estate, will be brought to account. The period when Israel was thus in the power of the heathen has lasted in the author's view down to his own time. It will be followed by the great Judgment and that in turn by the Messianic time.

A distinct bias against the Maccabean dynasty cannot be discovered in this book, but its emphasis is evidently laid much more on the expectation of divine interference for Israel than upon any help of man. Along with this expectation went an increased hatred of the Gentiles. An almost grotesque expression of this hatred is found in the historical romance which we call *Esther*, which is probably to be dated in this period. The plot is well known: A Persian king, apparently the Xerxes whose name was so well known to Asiatics and Europeans, takes offence at the disobedience of his favourite wife. A young Jewess is chosen as her successor, being the most beautiful of all the maidens of the kingdom. The dislike of Haman, minister of the king, for Mordecai, Esther's uncle, produces a decree that all Jews shall be exterminated. The salvation of the people is wrought by Esther, who risks her own life for them. As the decree of the king cannot be reversed, a new decree is issued authorising the Jews not only to defend themselves but to take vengeance upon their enemies. The result is the massacre of 75,000 victims and the institution of a festival to keep the memory of the event alive; the name of the festival is Purim.

The unpleasant story is certainly unhistorical. It was written to justify the adoption of a Gentile festival, which seems to have been the New Year of the Babylonians or Persians. The material of the book is taken from Babylonian mythology, though it has been wholly Judaised. It does not seem extravagant to suppose some such course of events as the following: The Jews of Babylonia borrowed the New Year's festival of their Gentile neighbours. Nicanor's day also came to them and was celebrated in conjunction with the other. As time went on, the true history was distorted by legend—the popular mind only held firmly to the memory of a remarkable deliverance wrought on behalf of the Jews. The myth of Ishtar and Marduk lent itself to dramatic treatment, and the heroine and hero donned Jewish

garb as Esther and Mordecai. Put into literary form by an author who found the folk-story ready to his hand, the book travelled back to Palestine. Here a party had arisen who were willing to forget the merits of the Maccabean princes, and who could justify the established festival on ground furnished by the new story. The bloodthirsty tone of the narrative agrees very well with the time when Pharisees and Sadducees were at swords' points, and the figure of a Great King who heard the prayers of his Jewish concubine would be congenial to those Scribes who were ready to appeal to the Syrian monarch against their own (Maccabean) princes. Whether Haman and Vashti are also mythological figures, as is now supposed, is a point not essential to our understanding of the story.¹

The book of Esther found a place in the Canon because it was so closely connected with the observance of one of the festivals. It belonged, however, to a considerable body of literature which comes in the class of folk-stories, the material of which was borrowed from the mythology or legends of the Gentiles. Such stories pass from one nation to another, and are recast so as to suit the taste of the readers in each new environment. The famous Thousand and One Nights are the mediæval redaction of these oriental tales, and it has even been suggested that Esther and Shahrazade are duplicates of the same original. Without going so far as to affirm this, we recognise the fact that the heroism of a woman willing to undergo any danger for the sake of her nation is a favourite theme for story-tellers in all times. It appears again in the book of Judith, which cannot be far removed in date from Esther. In this story Israel is delivered from destruction by Judith, a fair woman who ingratiates herself with the Gentile commander and slays him in the drunken sleep which

¹The somewhat complicated problems presented by the Purim festival cannot be discussed here. All that can be said concerning the Persian origin of the festival was said by Lagarde in his essay, *Purim* (1887). The hypothesis of a Babylonian origin was advanced by Zimmern in the *Zeitschr. f. d. Alttest. Wissensch.*, XI, p. 157 ff., and further developed by Meissner, *Zeitsch. d. Deutschen Morgenl. Gesellsch.*, L, p. 296 ff. The comparative method was, however, most fully applied by Jensen; see his letter to Wildeboer in the latter's commentary on the book of Esther, p. 173. Zimmern's present theory may be read in *Keilinschriften und Altes Testament*,³ p. 514 ff. An elaborate discussion of all the questions involved (with others) may be found in Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, III,² p. 172 ff.

falls upon him after a carouse. The strongly legalistic point of view is seen in the author's conviction that the people cannot be destroyed so long as they refuse to eat of food ritually unclean.

In this period also we may place the little story of Bel and the Dragon which was inserted in the Greek copies of the book of Daniel. The dragon episode is plainly mythological in origin, going back to the primeval monster of the Babylonian creation story. The discovery of the fraud practised by the priests of Bel, on the other hand, is a product of the Jewish imagination, to which the impotence of the false gods had become a commonplace. In this connexion we may consider also the story of Tobit, which has come to us in the Greek Bible. It has none of the blood-thirstiness of Esther and Judith and is on this account more pleasing than either. Its evident purpose is to confirm the strict Jews in the observance of the Law, showing us Tobit suffering for his fidelity, but finally vindicated and restored. The demonology of the book is more crass than anything we have yet considered—the heroine is persecuted by a demon who is in love with her and who slays seven bridegrooms before the consummation of the marriage. The smoke from the heart and liver of a fish is sufficient to banish this troublesome enemy, and we evidently find here a bit of popular superstition.

In this case we have a Jew represented as a high official at the court of a Gentile king. This figure is repeated in the later Jewish literature—Daniel, Zerubbabel, Tobit, Ahikar,¹ Mordecai, are all examples. No doubt the historical Nehemiah gave the precedent for all these figures. But Nehemiah was not the only Jew who was able to attain high position at a Gentile court. In the second century before Christ, we hear of one Aristobulus, a Jewish philosopher, who was a courtier of Ptolemy VI (Philometor).

Among the literary monuments of the period we may count the second book of Maccabees. This is a work of edification according to the taste of the times, and also a polemic against the Maccabean princes. It emphasises the miraculous interferences wrought for the benefit of Israel. At the very beginning it urges the observance of the Feast of Dedication, not so much because of the Maccabean recovery of the Temple, as because the sacred

¹ Ahikar is mentioned in the story of Tobit. Zerubbabel meets us at the court of Persia, in the Greek Esdras.

fire hidden by Jeremiah had been rediscovered at the return from the captivity.¹ In the rest of the history prodigies of all sorts abound. The narrator is interested in these for their own sake and also because he is able by them to enforce his own (Pharisaic) point of view. For it is clearly his conviction that the observance of the law will bring divine help without the direct effort of man. The exploits of Judas he cannot ignore, and he relates them with satisfaction. But he takes pains to leave out of view the differences between Judas and the Assideans, shows how scrupulously Judas himself observed the Sabbath, and refuses to allow merit to any of Judas's brothers. The result is a caricature instead of a history, and had we no other account of what took place in the period our ideas would be wholly wrong.

Another monument of Pharisaic thought which has come down to us from about this period is the so-called Book of Jubilees.² This work represents Moses receiving from the Angel of the Presence a copy of the heavenly tablet which contained the early history of mankind. This is the original which our book purports to reproduce; in reality it follows, though with great freedom, the canonical book of Genesis. Its object is to show that the Jewish Law had been followed by the Patriarchs. The Biblical history which the author cherished seemed to him lacking in this particular—it did not show Noah and Abraham to be righteous according to the Pharisaic standard. In rewriting the earlier history from his own point of view, the author was following the precedent set by the Priestly narrative of the Pentateuch, and again by the Chronicler. Having in mind theories of verbal inspiration and inerrancy, it is hard for us to appreciate this treatment of a sacred narrative. There are, however, abundant parallels in later times, especially in the allegorical exposition of the Old Testament by both Jewish and Christian scholars.

¹ This account is in one of the letters which the author prefixes to his work, and which he takes from an older source, 2 Macc. i 10-2 18.

² The reader will bear in mind that it is impossible to date some of these documents accurately. Jubilees is still an object of controversy in this respect, some scholars dating it soon after the Maccabean uprising, others placing it as late as the second half of the first Christian century. The book is preserved in an Ethiopic version and a considerable fragment also in Latin. The latest discussion is contained in Charles, *The Book of Jubilees* (1902), who gives also an English translation. A bibliography may be found in Schurer, *Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes*,³ III, p. 279.

The author's veneration for tradition leads him to emphasise the number seven. The earliest evidence of the sacredness of this number is the institution of the Sabbath. The Biblical narrative dates this institution at the creation; the Book of Jubilees tell us specifically that it is continually observed by the angels in heaven as it is by Israel on earth. The Law had also emphasised the number seven by commanding the Sabbatical year and the year of Jubilee. Our author makes this system the basis of his whole chronology, telling us how many jubilee periods and how many weeks of years had elapsed at each important point in the narrative. He makes fifty jubilee periods to have elapsed (2450 years) between the creation and the exodus. Probably he expected the whole duration of the world to fill a hundred jubilees, but this he leaves us to conjecture.

The emphasis laid upon the Law may be shown in the following particulars: Pentecost was observed in heaven until Noah's time, when it was first enjoined upon men; observed by Noah till his death, it was forgotten by his children and renewed by Abraham. The covenant with Abraham is dated precisely at this season of the year. In like manner the Feast of Tabernacles was observed in heaven till the time of Abraham, who began its observance upon earth. The Passover also is dated from the time, not of Moses, but of Abraham.

It does not surprise us to find that Abraham from his youth abhorred the idolatry of his fathers and even burned their idol temple with all its contents. Later Judaism is known to have expanded these legends, which are also a staple of Mohammedan tradition. The sacrifice of Isaac, on the other hand, is no longer commanded by God, but suggested by Satan. That the institution of tithes is traced to this Patriarch is quite in accord with our expectations, for there is some Biblical basis for such a statement.

We have already met the theory that the angels who were appointed over the nations were perverse or disobedient. Our author makes them, rather, the tempters of men. In the days of Noah they began to seduce and to befool and to destroy the children of men. At the prayer of Noah, God commanded that the evil angels should be shut up in prison. But Mastema (Satan), their prince, pleaded his office as tempter and his need of assistance in it, whereupon one-tenth of the number were left free.

They have now the power of afflicting men with disease. Noah, however, was taught how to exorcise them, and we may suppose that Jewish exorcists, whom we know to have swarmed in the Roman empire, claimed possession of the secret taught to Noah and committed by him to a book. These evil spirits are not identical with the angels who sinned by marriage with the daughters of men. These, our book claims, have been committed without exception to the abyss where they are reserved for the judgment of the Great Day.¹

Concerning the good angels, we learn that they were created on the first day of God's work. In the antediluvian period they were sent to teach men righteousness. Pre-eminent among them is the angel of revelation by whose mediation the heavenly tablets were delivered to Moses—an idea which was familiar to the New Testament writers.² The angels regulate the seasons and the course of the heavenly bodies. That the author holds pertinaciously to a year of 364 days we have already had occasion to remark. His reason for insistence on this point is that if the year observed in heaven is not observed on earth the whole system of feasts will go wrong: the real Passover, Pentecost, and Tabernacles are the ones observed in heaven, and if different ones are observed on earth then the holy seasons will be profaned.³

Opposition to Gentile customs shows itself in the commentary on God's giving clothing to Adam. The occasion for calling attention to this was the Greek gymnastic practice, which, as we have seen, gave offence in the time of Antiochus. So we find Noah enjoining upon his sons "to practise righteousness and cover their secret parts, to bless their Creator, to honour father and mother, to love one's neighbour, to keep from fornication, and all uncleanness."⁴ Under the head of uncleanness the eating of blood is, of course, included. The prohibition of blood was regarded as a primitive and universal law, the violation of which has brought all Gentiles under the curse of God. Intermarriage with those under such a curse is consequently an abomination, and it is here objurgated with great energy—the man or woman who is guilty of it is a defiler of the sanctuary.

¹ Jubilees, 10¹⁻¹⁴, 4²², 5¹⁻⁵ cf. Jude, v. 6.

² *Ibid.*, 1²⁷⁻²⁹, 2¹; cf. Acts, 7^{38, 53}, Gal. 3¹⁹.

³ *Ibid.*, 6²¹⁻³⁸.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 7²⁰.

This author expects a Messianic time. The course of history up to his own day is sketched as one of increasing degeneracy, marked by a progressive shortening of men's lives. But "in those days" men will begin to seek the Law and to turn toward the ways of righteousness. Then their lives will begin to grow longer until they reach the measure of a thousand years. In their old age they will retain the strength of youth; no enemy will destroy them, but all their days will be days of blessing. Such are the general terms in which the good time coming is described. Little emphasis is laid upon the personal Messiah. The tribe of Levi is to give princes and judges and chiefs to the sons of Jacob. This points to the predominance of the high-priests and probably to the continued rule of the Macca-bean family. At the same time Judah is promised dominion, and it is said that the Gentiles will fear before his face. The words are put into the mouth of Abraham and might be supposed to refer to David. But probably the writer expects the glory of David's kingdom to be renewed by one of his sons. In other late Jewish writings we find the combination of Levi and Judah as the tribes from which the Messiah is to spring.¹

Alexander at his death (B.C. 76) left the kingdom to his queen Alexandra. Josephus tells us that by her husband's advice she made peace with the Pharisees, and gave them the leading place in her councils. Whether this was the reason, or whether she was naturally inclined to follow these religious leaders, her conduct accorded with this programme. "She restored those practices which the Pharisees had introduced according to the tradition of their forefathers, but which Hyrcanus had abolished."² What Pharisaic traditions were restored we are not told. But it is evident that the method of enforcing them was the same pursued by the other party, for the queen was obliged to restrain the ferocity of her new counsellors. The members of the royal family were no more in harmony with each other than is usually the case in palaces. Aristobulus, the more energetic of Alexandra's two sons, was openly on the side of the Sadducees.

At the death of the queen (B.C. 67), her two sons were in arms against each other. Hyrcanus, the elder, was already in possession of the high-priesthood, but Aristobulus was now strong

¹ See the note of Charles, *Book of Jubilees*, p. 188.

² Josephus, *Ant.*, XIII, 16, 1; *Jewish War*, I, 5.

enough to compel him to resign it and to resign also all claims to the royal power. But one Antipater, an Idumean by race, who had held high office under Alexandra, saw his opportunity to attain power and espoused the cause of Hyrcanus. The fears of the prince were wrought upon by representations that he was not safe in Jerusalem, and he fled to Aretas, King of the Nabateans. Antipater accompanied him and urged Aretas to restore Hyrcanus to his rights. This the Arab promised to do on condition of certain concessions of territory.¹ He found a considerable party of Jews on the side of Hyrcanus—Pharisees probably, since Aristobulus was in the hands of the Sadducees.

The invaders on behalf of Hyrcanus succeeded in shutting up Aristobulus in the Temple and his cause was looking desperate, when a new power appeared upon the scene. The Romans were now regulating affairs in the East, with Pompey the Great as their general. One of his officers, Scaurus, appeared at Damascus and both the Jewish claimants appeared before him. He took the part of Aristobulus, and the patron of Hyrcanus was obliged to retreat. Two years later (B.C. 63) Pompey himself appeared at Damascus. Both princes appealed to him, as did also a deputation of the people who wished that the monarchy might be abolished and the priestly constitution restored. No doubt the mass of the people were tired of the court with its quarrels, its mercenaries, and its foreign alliances. They thought they could content themselves under foreign governors if only they were allowed the free exercise of their religion. This was according to Pharisaic tradition, but the rule of the foreigner was yet to show them how impossible it is to separate religion and secular affairs.

Pompey gave ear to the people so far as to command Aristobulus to restore the priestly constitution, apparently intending that he should resign the kingly title and give a share in the administration to the Sanhedrin. In dissatisfaction with the way things were going, Aristobulus suddenly left the camp of the Romans. To the demand that he surrender the fortresses of the country he delayed answer, hoping to prepare Jerusalem for resistance, but at the appearance of the Roman army he gave up

¹ The Idumeans had been circumcised by John Hyrcanus and thus made full citizens of the Jewish commonwealth. But the conviction that the Herods were only half Jews came into prominence again and again in this last period of Jewish history.

the city. Without his consent the more determined or the more fanatical of the people seized the Temple and defied the foreigner. The strength of the building was such that it had to be reduced by regular siege. It took three months to breach the walls, and the storming party then put the garrison to the sword. The Roman general profaned the shrine by entering where, in theory, no one but the high-priest was allowed to enter. But he spared the treasures of the Temple and arranged to have the service continued without interruption.

Aristobulus having forfeited his office by his conduct, the high-priestly organisation was restored, and Hyrcanus II was recognised as its head. The districts conquered by his father and grandfather were, however, taken away and united with the newly organised Roman province of Syria. The principality of Judea in its diminished extent was laid under tribute and Aristobulus, with a large company of Jewish captives, was carried to Rome, where (B.C. 61) he was shown in the triumph of the great general. The independence of the nation was gone for ever.

The following years were years of disorder. The Romans were not always in accord with each other; the Arabs were troublesome neighbours; the Parthians threatened Syria, and the Roman armies were a burden to the province which they were expected to defend. Some of the proconsuls were notorious for their extortions, and to their oppressions were speedily added the miseries of civil war. Alexander, son of Aristobulus, escaped from captivity, succeeded in raising a band of soldiers, and made an attempt to regain the ancestral throne. After the insurrection was quelled, Gabinius, governor of the province, deprived the impotent Hyrcanus of the civil power and divided Judea into five districts, each under a council of notables—organised we may suppose after the model of the central Sanhedrin. To Hyrcanus was left only the care of the Temple.

The unruly Aristobulus again raised the standard of revolt, but was easily overcome and sent in chains to Rome (B.C. 55). The next year his son Alexander renewed the attempt, but was also defeated. These repeated struggles show the hold which the Maccabean princes had on the people. Already we taste the quality of the zeal which later brought Jerusalem to destruction. One head, however, remained cool in the time of fanaticism—the crafty Antipater appreciated the power of the Romans and

knew how to make that power work to his advantage. Gabinius found him useful in bringing the Jews to a better mind during the revolt of Alexander, and further services of this kind did not go unrewarded.

Of Crassus, who succeeded Gabinius, we may say that his little finger was thicker than his predecessor's loins. He appropriated to himself without ceremony the Temple treasure, now computed at ten thousand talents. Soon after this, and perhaps on this account, we find the Jews again in rebellion. Again they were defeated. Thirty thousand unhappy beings are said to have been sold into slavery at this time. Antipater was again useful to the Romans in this affair.

In the civil war Cæsar attempted to use Aristobulus against the Pompeians, but the death of his client frustrated the plan. The victory of Cæsar over Pompey (B.C. 48) showed Antipater on which side his interest lay. He rendered the victor substantial aid in Egypt, and Cæsar rewarded him by making Hyrcanus ethnarch of the Jews, and by confirming Antipater in the office of administrator. Permission was given to rebuild the walls of Jerusalem, and the Jews outside of Palestine received some benefits. Those in Alexandria were elevated to full citizenship and their rights and immunities were set forth on a pillar of bronze. Other local decrees exempting the Jews from onerous restrictions are dated in the same period.

The family of Antipater profited by the friendship of the Romans—Hyrcanus was too weak or too lazy to concern himself with the work of government. With his consent Antipater's two sons were appointed to military command—Phasael the older in Judea, Herod in Galilee. Both were able and energetic men, but Herod, at this time only twenty-five years of age, especially distinguished himself. His province was infested with banditti, a natural consequence of the unsettled state of the country. Herod made short work with these, putting their chief Hezekiah with a number of his followers to death. A collision with Jewish prejudice was the result. The theory of the Sanhedrin was that they as the supreme council were also the supreme court, and that the power of life and death was in their hands. The Jewish bandits had been executed without due process of law, and Herod was summoned to give account. He appeared at Jerusalem with an armed force and it required the severe conscience of

a revered teacher, Shemaiah by name, to hold the court faithful to its duty. As it turned out, Herod escaped sentence only because the Roman Proconsul warned Hyrcanus against allowing harm to come to him. The case was fitted to throw light upon the conflict of jurisdiction, a conflict which was unavoidable in the circumstances, but which none the less kept the nation in a state of irritation from this time forward.

This is not the place to give a biography of Herod. His energy, his unscrupulousness, and his shiftiness, all gave him value in the eyes of his Roman masters. From his father he learned or inherited the art of getting on the winning side. The Idumean dynasty "took part at first for Pompey, then for Cæsar the father, then for Cassius and Brutus, then for the Triumvirs, then for Antony, then for Cæsar the son; fidelity varied as did the watchword. Nevertheless, this conduct is not to be denied the merit of consistency and firmness."¹ The policy was not altogether new; something of the same kind was observed in Jonathan's dealings with the Syrian crown. But the Idumeans were much more proficient.

Herod did what he could to give his posterity a claim to the throne by marrying Mariamne, the granddaughter both of Hyrcanus and of Aristobulus.² Between the betrothal and the marriage, the fortunes of the young governor fell to their lowest ebb. In the year 40 B.C. the Parthians overran Syria. Antigonus, the heir of Aristobulus and representative of the Macabean claims, secured their aid by the promise of money and by agreeing to hand over to them five hundred Jewish maidens. The invaders got possession of Jerusalem, capturing Phasael and Hyrcanus, both of whom they put into chains. Herod with difficulty got his family and a few faithful followers into security at Masada, a stronghold in the Wilderness of Judah.³ Leaving them in safety he made his way to Rome, where he found a welcome from Antony and Octavian, and by decree of the Senate was made king of Judea.

The decree of the Senate was in effect a permission to con-

¹ Mommsen, *The Provinces of the Roman Empire* (1886), II, p. 179.

² She was daughter of Alexander, son of Aristobulus II; her mother was Alexandra, daughter of Hyrcanus II.

³ On the locality, now *Sebbeh*, see Baedeker, *Palestine and Syria*,² p. 141 ff.

quer a kingdom if he could, for the country was actually in possession of his enemies. But the energy and ability which had marked his career as governor of Galilee were not lacking in this crisis. With an army recruited from Samaritans, Idumeans, and mercenaries of all sorts, Herod soon reduced Galilee and defeated the adherents of Antigonus. When it came to the siege of Jerusalem he had Roman help, at first very grudgingly given.¹ After the usual obstinate resistance the city was taken by storm. Antigonus was taken to Antioch by the Romans and there beheaded. Herod was in possession of his kingdom, B.C. 37, nearly three years after his nomination to it by the Senate.

The state of feeling among the people during these commotions is revealed by a little collection of poems which has come down to us under the name "Psalms of Solomon." Their author is a member of the sect of Pharisees. The first thing that attracts our notice is his opinion of the Maccabean rulers. In their overthrow by the Romans he sees the just judgment of God. These princes, sons of Israel, have profaned the sanctuary in which they ministered. Their luxury and their sins are worse than those of the heathen. The ordinance of God in favour of David and his seed has been set aside by these usurpers; therefore He has overthrown them and sent their seed out of the land.² The judgment thus described is the one inflicted by Pompey. But though Pompey was the instrument of the divine decree, his defilement of the Temple must call down vengeance. His ignominious death in Egypt is represented as a punishment for his sacrilege.

If now the monarchy of the Hasmoneans was looked upon as a usurpation, that of Herod must have been tenfold more offensive. The Maccabeans were, at any rate, pure-blooded Israelites; Herod was only an Idumean with a thin varnish of Judaism. The Messianic expectation had already taken such shape that it would be content with nothing less than a miraculous restoration of the throne of David to an undoubted descendant of that king. The fervent, even feverish, desire for this consummation is one of the characteristics of the period:

¹ Antony sent him troops, but the officers were bribed to inaction by Antigonus.

² Ps. Sol. I, 2^{3,6}, 17^{4,12}.

" See, O Lord, and raise up for them a king,
 The son of David at the time Thou hast appointed;
 That he may rule over Israel, Thy servant.
 Gird him with strength to crush unjust rulers,
 Purge Jerusalem from Gentiles who tread it down to ruin.
 In wisdom and righteousness let him drive out sinners from our
 heritage;
 Breaking in pieces the pride of the sinner, like a potter's vessel;
 With a rod of iron breaking all their strength." ¹

It was evident from the outset that a Herod could not meet this expectation. All his endeavours to conciliate Jewish feeling were met by sullen apathy, or by fierce resistance, and the resistance was motived by the belief that the Messiah would appear on behalf of the faithful.

With the establishment of Herod upon the throne of Jerusalem, Old Testament history may properly end. Herod was simply the agent of the Roman power; the independence of the nation was gone. In fact, as we look at the Jewish people in the time of Herod we see them no longer a nation, but an agglomeration of sects united indeed by their common blood, but separated by mutual distrust and hatred. A small fraction was bound to the reigning family by motives of self-interest; the Sadducees were partisans of the Maccabean dynasty and hoped for a hierocracy in which theirs should be the dominant place; the Pharisees were students and expounders of the Law of Moses, hoping for a Messianic time in which the Sanhedrin would bear rule in the house of God, with themselves in the majority. Among their followers two parties developed; one was made up of the more impatient spirits who were ready to draw the sword for the cause of God and His Law; the other was the party of the quiet in the land, who were willing to suffer and wait for God's time. The impatient souls soon began to band themselves together as Zealots; the extremists in the party of quietism began to retire from the world in monastic communities, and are known as Essenes. Thus Judaism was hopelessly divided into factions hating each other, some of them hating the Gentiles with equal

¹ Ps. Sol. 17 ²³⁻²⁶. The consent of scholars in favour of dating the Psalms of Solomon in this period is broken by Frankenberg, who refers them to the early Maccabean period (*Die Datirung der Psalmen Salomo's*, 1896); see Schürer, *Gesch. des Jüd. Volkes*, ³ III, p. 150 ff.

ardour. Their jealousies and bickerings and their spasmodic outbreaks against the Roman power do not belong in an Old Testament history.

But during the period we have now reached, the Judaism outside of Palestine was growing in importance. We have already seen that colonies of Jews were settled in Greek cities before the Maccabean uprising, and that emigration was stimulated by the internal troubles of Judea. In the Roman period the Jews were favoured by Cæsar; and Herod the Great did as much for the people to which he claimed to belong, by defending their liberties in Greek cities, as he did by his rule in Jerusalem. It is strange that a world mission should have been assigned to these Jews of the Dispersion, for they were not usually liked by their Gentile neighbours. Their shrewdness in trade, their clannishness, their ill-concealed abhorrence of the gods and temples, their tenacity of Sabbath and circumcision—all these things caused them to be regarded as outlandish and uncongenial. But they had some things which made a deep impression on the more thoughtful Gentiles. They had a serious faith in God and they had the synagogue in which that faith was taught. They also had a Bible, a Book of God, the source of instruction and of comfort to despondent or perplexed souls. While Judaism in Palestine was nearing its end, the Judaism of the Dispersion was preparing to receive and propagate the new and expansive religion of Jesus Christ.

APPENDIX

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE

The following is a list of the principal dates assumed in this work. The reader should bear in mind that in many cases they can be no more than approximate.¹

B. C.	
2000	Palestine under Babylonian rule.
to	Introduction of the Babylonian script.
1500	Egypt in control of Palestine.
1400	Hebrew clans sojourning in Kadesh.
1300	The Palestinian cities nominally under Egyptian rule, but harassed by invasions of the Bedawin.
1270	A clan called Israel already settled in Canaan.
	Period of Israel's Judges.
	The Song of Deborah.
1030	Saul establishes the Benjamite Kingdom.
1010	David's coronation at Hebron.
	Writing down of poems hitherto circulated orally.
973	Solomon's coronation.
963	Dedication of the Temple.
	Collection of folk stories; traditions of the Patriarchs and of the Judges.
	Possible beginning of legal literature (collection of decisions as precedents).
	The Blessing of Jacob (Gen. 49).
933	Jeroboam leads the revolt of the northern tribes.
	Earliest biography of David.
	Invasion by Shishak.
900	Book of the Covenant (Ex. 20 22-23).
880	Omri founds a new dynasty in Israel.
854	Ahab at the battle of Karkar.
	Conflict of the Baal party and the Yahweh party in Israel; Elijah leader of the Yahweh party.
842	Jehu of Israel and Athaliah of Judah.
	The Blessing of Moses (Deut. 33).
800	Legends of Elijah and Elisha written down.
783	Jeroboam II.
	The Yahwistic narrative (J).
750	The Elohistic narrative (E).
	Amos.

¹ A Students' *Chart of Biblical History*, prepared by Professor Kent in 1895, will be found useful, as also the table in Kautzsch, *Abriss der Geschichte des alttestamentlichen Schrifttums*, 1894 (now published in English).

B. C.

- 743 Decline of the northern kingdom.
Hosea.
- 740 Beginning of Isaiah's career.
- 736 Ahaz king in Judah.
- 735 Invasion of Judah by Israel and Syria; tribute paid by Ahaz to Tiglath-pileser of Assyria.
Isaiah opposes the policy of Ahaz.
Deportation of inhabitants from many districts of Israel.
- 721 Fall of Samaria, deportation of a considerable number of its inhabitants, and importation of foreigners.
- 720 Hezekiah.
Culmination of Isaiah's prophetic activity.
Micah 1-3.
- 701 Invasion of Sennacherib.
Religious reforms under the influence of Isaiah.
- 692 Manasseh.
Religious reaction with persecution of the prophetic party.
- 640 Josiah.
- 628 The Scythian invasion.
Beginning of Jeremiah's activity.
- 623 Finding of the Book of Instruction (Deut. 12-19, 26, 28) in the Temple.
Religious reforms on the basis of this Book.
- 620 Nahum.
Zephaniah
Habakkuk 1 and 2.
- 608 Josiah slain at Migdol.
- 606 Fall of Nineveh.
- 605 Battle of Carchemish.
First edition of Jeremiah's discourses.
- 597 First deportation of Judaites to Babylonia in company with Jehoiachin.
Zedekiah king; continued activity of Jeremiah.
- 593 Ezekiel begins to preach to the exiles.
- 586 Fall of Jerusalem.
Jeremiah's latest discourses.
Ezekiel's constructive activity.
- 561 Release of Jehoiachin by Evil-merodach.
Enlarged edition of Deuteronomy.
Deuteronomistic redaction of Judges and Kings.
- 550 Lamentations.
The Holiness Code (Lev. 11, 17-26).
- 539 Cyrus takes possession of Babylon.
- 521 Darius I.
Haggai and Zechariah (1-8).
- 516 The second Temple dedicated.
- 450 Malachi.
- 400 Job.
Isaiah 40-66.
- 385 Mission of Nehemiah; rebuilding of the walls of Jerusalem.
The Priestly narrative of the Pentateuch (P).
- 350 Combination of the Priestly narrative with the older book of the Law and addition of all extant priestly traditions.
Ruth.
Joel.
Isaiah, 24-27.
- 333 Alexander takes possession of Syria.

B. C.

- 320 Ptolemy I captures Jerusalem.
 250 Chronicles.
 Zechariah, 9-14.
 The Song of Songs.
 Jonah.
 The nucleus of the Book of Proverbs.
 200 Book of Jesus ben Sira.
 The Book of Proverbs completed.
 180 Ecclesiastes.
 175 Accession of Antiochus Epiphanes.
 168 Desecration of the Temple.
 167 Revolt of the Maccabees.
 165 The Book of Daniel.
 Dedication of the Temple.
 161 Jonathan succeeds Judas.
 Translation of the Pentateuch into Greek in Alexandria.
 153 Jonathan appointed high-priest by Demetrius.
 142 Simon succeeds Jonathan and is appointed high-priest and prince by
 the Jewish people.
 Final redaction of the Book of Psalms.
 134 John Hyrcanus.
 Active opposition of the Pharisaic party to the Maccabean house.
 The First Book of Maccabees.
 103 Alexander Jannæus.
 The Book of Enoch.
 100 The Book of Esther.
 The Book of Judith.
 The Second Book of Maccabees.
 The Book of Jubilees.
 63 Pompey in Syria.
 The Psalms of Solomon.
 40 Herod appointed King of Judea by the Roman Senate.
 37 Herod in possession of Jerusalem.

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

	PAGE		PAGE
Aaron and his Sons	403	Antipater	492
Abimelech	97	Apocalypses	451
Abner and David	139	Apocalyptic Expectation	411
Abraham	50	Apollonius, Defeat of	449
Absalom's Revolt	148	Aristeas, Letter of	476
Achish, King of Gath	131	Aristobulus I	482
Adonijah	152	Aristobulus II	492
Adullam	135	Ark, The	71
Ahab	187	Ark, Capture of the	112
Ahab and Jezebel	187	Ark brought to Jerusalem, The	144
Ahab and Judah	188	Ark of Yahweh, The	111
Ahaz	234	Artaxerxes	382
Ahaz and Assyria	227	Artaxerxes, Decree of	390
Ahaz besieged	235	Artaxerxes, Letter to	350
Ahaz visits Tiglath-pileser	227	Artaxerxes Ochus	410
Alexander Balas	467	Asa's Alliance with Syria	186
Alexander Jannæus	482	Assassination	89
Alexander, Legend of	413	Ashurbanipal	258
Alexander the Great	413	Assideans, The	448
Alexandra, Queen	491	Assyria	194
Alexandria, Jews in	415	Assyrian Policy, The	225
Alkimus, High-priest	463	Athaliah's Usurpation	203
Altar	167	Atonement, Day of	405
Amalekites and David	132		
Amaziah	207	Baal and Yahweh	171, 222
Amaziah and Jehoash	207	Baal in Israel	172
Ammonite Invasion	114	Baal Perazim	135
Amon, King of Judah	259	Baal, The Tyrian	189
Amorites, Conflict with	76	Baasha	183
Amos	211	Babylon captured by Cyrus	342
Angels	14, 19	Babylonian Conceptions	18
Angels, Doctrine of	355	Babylonian Flood-story	28
Angels, Fall of the	484	Babylonian Influence	22
Angels in the Book of Daniel	457	Bacchides	463
Angels in the Book of Jubilees	489	Barak	92
Animal Worship	269	Baruch, Jeremiah's Scribe	289
Anointing of Saul	109	Bel and the Dragon	487
Anthropomorphism	18	Belshazzar	456
Antiochus the Great	416	Benhadad and Ahab	188
Antiochus III	441	Benjamin, War upon	107
Antiochus IV, Accession of	442	Berossus	28
Antiochus IV and Egypt	442, 444	Bethel	45, 220
Antiochus IV at Jerusalem	444	Bethel and Dan	180
Antiochus IV, Death of	461	Beth-horon, Battle of	82
Antiochus V	461	Beth-shemesh	113
Antiochus VI	468	Beth-zacharias, Battle of	462
Antiochus VII	478	Blessing of Jacob	41, 175

	PAGE		PAGE
Blood, Efficacy of.....	325	Danites, The	85
Blood Revenge	89, 174	Darius, Letter to.....	351
Body-guard, The	203	David and Abner.....	139
Book of Instruction, The.....	260	David at Hebron.....	133
Bulls, Golden	181	David, Introduction of.....	122
		David made King.....	142
Cæsar and the Jews	494	David and Michal.....	123, 145
Cain.....	23	David and Nabal.....	130
Cain's Genealogy	23	David an Outlaw.....	129
Caleb.....	84	David, Saul's Jealousy of.....	123
Calves, The Golden	180	David's Character.....	154
Canaan before the Conquest....	77	David's Court	147
Canaan, Conquest of	73	David's Foreign Wars.....	146
Canaanite Peoples.....	74	Day of Yahweh, The.....	216
Canaanite Religion.....	190	Dead Sea.....	44
Canaanites and Israelites.....	172	Deborah	92
Canaanites, Strength of the....	86	Decalogue, The Earliest.....	68
Captivity of Israel.....	229	Decalogue of J.....	210
Carchemish, Battle of	282	Dedication, The Feast of.....	460
Chasidim, The	448, 464	Dedication of the Temple.....	459
Chasidim, Programme of the..	456	Deluge, The	26
Chedorlaomer	37	Deluge Stories.....	30
Cherubim, The	167, 303	Demetrius, King of Syria.....	463
Chronicle, Method of the....	345	Deportations, The Assyrian....	226
Chronicles, Books of.....	4, 419	Deportation, The First.....	285, 286
Chronology.....	21, 202	Desecration of the Temple.....	444
Chronology of the Flood	32	Deuteronomic Literature.....	332
Chronology of Hezekiah's Reign	238	Deuteronomist's Ideal, The... 271	
Circumcision	66	Deuteronomy and the Prophets..	273
Circumcision in the Exile.....	328	Deuteronomy, Influence of....	264
City, Importance of the Greek..	417	Deuteronomy, Purpose of.....	266
Concubinage	174	Deuteronomy, Supplements to..	332
Confusion of Tongues, The....	13	Dinah, The Story of.....	41
Conquest, Earliest Account of		Dirge over Abner	141
the	83	Dispersion of Jews, The	498
Corruption of Judah.....	253	Divorce of Gentile Wives.....	394
Corvée, The.....	157	Dry Bones, Ezekiel's Vision of.	318
Covenant between Israel and			
Yahweh	69, 70	E, Work of	219
Covenant, Book of the.....	174	Ecclesiastes	436
Covenant in Deuteronomy.....	268	Eden.....	24
Covenant of Josiah.....	262	Edom conquered by Amaziah..	207
Covenant with Noah, The	33	Edom and Israel.....	41
Covenants between Israel and		Edom, Revolt of.....	170
Canaanites	79	Egypt and Antiochus.....	442, 444
Creation, Babylonian Account of	18	Egypt and Assyria	279
Creation, P's Account.....	16	Egypt and Hezekiah	247
Creation Story, The.....	13	Egypt and Israel.....	227
Criticism, Higher	2	Egypt and Judah.....	242
Cyrus, Career of	341	Egypt, Sojourn in.....	54
Cyrus, his Proclamation.....	344	Ehud.....	90
		Ekron's Revolt.....	242
Damascus and Assyria.....	207	El Amarna Tablets, The....	36, 76
Damascus, Fall of.....	228	Elijah.....	190, 191
Dan and Bethel.....	180	Elijah at Mount Carmel.....	192
Daniel, The Book of	451	Elijah and Jehu.....	193

	PAGE		PAGE
Elijah, Memoirs of.....	209	Greek Religion	418
Elisha's Death.....	206	Greek Version, The	476
Eli's Sons	111	Habakkuk, The Book of.....	285
Elohist, The.....	219	Haggai, his Preaching	353
Eltekeh, Battle of.....	243	Haggai and Zechariah	349
Enoch, The Book of.....	483	Hair, Samson's.....	103
En Rogel.....	152	Hammurabi, Laws of.....	173
Ephod, Gideon's.....	96	Heathenism in Judah.....	262
Ephraim's Revolt.....	178	Hebron.....	133
Epicureanism.....	438	Hellenising Influences.....	443
Esau a Clan Name.....	39	Herod.....	494
Esarhaddon and Egypt.....	258	Herod made King.....	495
Esther, The Book of.....	485	Hezekiah and Egypt.....	247
Evil-merodach	327	Hezekiah and Sennacherib	243
Exclusiveness, Postexilic.....	399	Hezekiah's Accession.....	238
Exiles' Condition in Babylonia.	301	Hezekiah's Reforms.....	239
Exiles, Expectations of the....	294	Higher Criticism, The.....	2
Exodus, Narrative of.....	52	High-places Destroyed	262
Ezekiel	302	High-priesthood, The	467
Ezekiel's Call.....	302	Hiram and Solomon.....	159
Ezekiel, his Character	326	Historical Books.....	3
Ezekiel's Individualism.....	311	History, The Hebrew Scheme of	11
Ezekiel's Symbols.....	304	Holiness Code, The.....	333
Ezekiel's Theory of the Divine		Holiness of Yahweh.....	322
Justice	306	Horeb, Elijah at.....	192
Ezra and Nehemiah	345	Horeb and Sinai	64
Ezra, Story of his Mission....	390	Hosea and Amos	222
Fall of Man, The	16	Hosea and the Monarchy	225
Famine in David's Time	150	Hosea, The Book of.....	221
Fasting.....	119	Hoshea, King of Israel.....	228
Feast of Dedication	460	Human Sacrifice	100, 235
Festivals.....	67	Hyrcanus II.....	491
Flood, The.....	26	Idolatry after the Exile	378
Gabriel, The Angel	457	Idolatry under Manasseh.....	256
Gath, David subject to.....	131	Idolatry in the Temple.....	305
Gedaliah, Babylonian Governor	297	Idolatry, Suppression of	266
Genealogies	20	Idols, Contempt of.....	371
Gentile Customs opposed.....	490	Idols in the Temple	269
Gibeah of Benjamin	107	Isaiah and Sennacherib	246
Gibeon, Battle of	138	Isaiah's Faith.....	251
Gibeonites, The	150	Isaiah's Politics	236
Gideon	95	Ishbaal.....	128, 136
Gihon	153	Israel, Early Mention	75
Gilboa, Battle of.....	127	Israel, Lack of Unity in	88
Gilead, The Jews in.....	460	Israel and the Canaanites.....	99
Gymnasium in Jerusalem.....	443	Israel's Disunion.....	106
God's Choice of Israel.....	373	Israel's Foreign Policy.....	224
Gog, Ezekiel's Vision of	316	Israel's Prophetic Mission....	371
Gog and Magog.....	316	Israel's Restoration	318
Goliath	135	J, The Book of.....	14, 210
Gorgias, Defeat of.....	450	Jabesh Gilead.....	114, 128
Goshen	61	Jachin and Boaz.....	165
Greek Culture	443	Jacob	43
Greek Influence in Palestine...	417		

	PAGE		PAGE
Jacob, The Name of a People..	38	Josiah's Reforms.....	265
Jacob's Sons	40	Josiah Slain.....	279
Jael and Sisera	93	Jotham	233
Jason and Onias	443	Jubilees, Book of.....	6, 488
Jealousy Ordeal, The.....	405	Judah	94
Jehoahaz of Israel.....	206	Judaism, Rise of.....	389
Jehoahaz of Judah	281	Judas Maccabeus	449
Jehoash of Israel.....	206	Judas Maccabeus, Death of....	465
Jehoash and Amaziah.....	207	Judges, Book of.....	6, 87
Jehoash's Coronation.....	204	Judges, Nature of their Office..	88
Jehoiachin carried captive....	284	Judgment of the Gentiles.....	409
Jehoiakim	281	Justice, Ezekiel's Theory of... 311	
Jehoshaphat	197	Justice, Theory of the Divine..	363
Jehu anointed	198		
Jehu and Assyria.....	201	Kadesh.....	62, 69
Jehu's suppression of Baal- worship	200	Karkar, Battle of	195
Jephthah	99	Keilah, David at.....	135
Jephthah's Daughter.....	100	Kenites, The	93
Jeremiah, Writing of his Book..	289	Kingdom of God, The.....	379
Jeremiah and the Scythians....	275	Koheleth	436
Jeremiah and Zedekiah.....	296	Korah, The Story of.....	404
Jeremiah arrested	283		
Jeremiah imprisoned	295	Lamech.....	24
Jeremiah's Character	286	Lamentations, The Book of....	340
Jeremiah's Pessimism.....	278	Lavers in the Temple.....	166
Jeroboam ben Nebat	171, 177	Law, Embodiment of Wisdom in the	429
Jeroboam's Reign.....	180	Law, Introduction of the.....	400
Jeroboam's Revolt.....	178	Law of the Hebrews.....	174
Jeroboam II.....	208	Legalism, First Stage of.....	274
Jerusalem, Affection for.....	473	Leontopolis, Temple at.....	446
Jerusalem captured by David ..	136	Levi, Choice of	403
Jerusalem, Disorders in.....	443	Levites, The	5
Jerusalem invested by Nebu- chadrezzar	294	Levites, Ezekiel's Regulations..	324
Jerusalem, Rebuilding of the Wall	385	Lions, Ravages of.....	231
Jerusalem taken by Jehoash....	207	Literature, Early.....	104
Jerusalem's Sin	307	Lot, The Sacred.....	120
Jews, Independence of the	468	Lot, The Story of	47
Jezebel	187	Lysias, Defeat of.....	451
Jezebel's Death.....	200		
Joab and Abner.....	140	Maccabean Dynasty established	470
Job, The Book of.....	363	Maccabean Success.....	459
Joel, Book of.....	408	Maccabees, The.....	449
John Hyrcanus	478	Maccabees, First Book of	483
Jonadab ben Rechab	191, 291	Maccabees, Second Book of... 487	
Jonah, The Book of.....	425	Maçceba, The	45, 220, 267
Jonathan	116	Mahanaim	128
Jonathan's Transgression	120	Malachi, Book of	360
Jonathan Maccabeus.....	466	Manasseh, King of Judah.....	254
Joram at Jezreel	196	Manetho.....	55
Joshua	80	Mattathias, Revolt of.....	448
Joshua the Chief Priest.....	356	Media and Nineveh.....	276
Josiah's Accession	260	Megiddo, Battle of.....	279
Josiah, Character of.....	280	Menahem of Israel.....	226
		Menelaus	444
		Mephibosheth	150
		Meribbaal.....	150

	PAGE		PAGE
Meribah	62	P.....	12
Merodach-baladan	241	P's Flood-story.....	31
Merom, Battle of.....	82	Palestine, Situation of.....	73
Mesha of Moab.....	197	Paneas, Battle of.....	441
Messiah in the Book of Enoch, The	483	Parthians in Syria, The.....	495
Messiah, Zerubbabel the	357	Passover, The.....	67
Messianic Expectation	475, 491	Passover, Josiah's.....	267
Messianic Faith, Israel's.....	252	Patriarchs, History of the....	35
Messianic Hope, The.....	338, 424	Patriarchal Period, The.....	48
Messianic Hope, Zechariah's..	358	Pekah invades Judah.....	233
Messianic King, The.....	320	Pharaoh Hophra.....	295
Micah, The Prophet.....	252	Pharaoh Necho.....	279
Micaiah	195	Pharisees, Rise of the.....	479
Michal and David.....	123, 145	Philistines, The.....	102
Michal returned	139	Philistine Campaigns, David's.	136
Michmash, Battle of.....	117	Philistine Power, The.....	114
Midianite Invasion.....	95	Philistine Supremacy.....	106
Midrash	6	Plagues, The.....	57
Migrations	73	Plague in David's Time, The..	151
Mizpah	450	Pompey the Great.....	492
Moabite Revolt, The.....	196	Popular Assembly, The Jewish.	468
Moloch	263	Priest-code, The.....	4
Monarchy, Rise of the.....	114	Priestly Writer, The....	11, 35, 400
Moses.....	56	Priests, Ezekiel's Regulations for	323
Moses, Blessing of.....	209	Priests, Income of.....	205
Moses, The Song of.....	291	Prophet, The.....	110
Murder, Punishment of.....	174	Prophetic Canon, The.....	408
Nabal and David.....	130	Prophetic Guilds, The.....	193
Nabonidus	342	Proverbs, The Book of.....	432
Nabopolassar.....	277	Psalms, The Book of.....	471
Naboth	187	Psalms of Solomon.....	496
Nahash, the Ammonite.....	114	Ptolemy I at Jerusalem.....	415
Nahum, Book of.....	277	Purim, Feast of.....	485
Nazirite, The.....	103	Qedeshim, The	262
Nehemiah.....	382	Queen of Heaven, Worship of the	298
Nehemiah, Importance of....	411	Rabshakeh before Jerusalem...	244
Nebiim	109	Ramoth Gilead.....	195
Nebuchadrezzar besieges Jeru- salem	294	Reaction under Manasseh	255
Nebuchadrezzar, Death of....	327	Rechabites, The.....	291
Nebuchadrezzar in Palestine....	283	Redeemer of Israel, The.....	373
Nebuchadrezzar at Riblah....	284	Red Sea, Crossing of the.....	60
Nehushtan	239	Rehoboam at Shechem.....	177
Nicanor, Defeat of.....	464	Rephaim, Valley of	135
Nineveh, Fall of.....	277	Restoration, Ezekiel's Vision of the.....	314
Noah.....	27	Resurrection, Doctrine of the..	484
Nob, Destruction of.....	125	Return, Chronicler's Theory of the.....	346
Nomad Life.....	43	Revolt of the Ten Tribes.....	178
Obed-edom.....	144	Rezin of Damascus.....	226
Omri.....	183	Rezon of Damascus.....	171
Omri, The House of.....	184	Ritual, Jeremiah's Attitude....	288
Onias, High-priest.....	443	Ritual, Popular Conception of..	213
Othniel.....	89	Rizpah	138

	PAGE		PAGE
Rizpah's Devotion.....	150	Shishak's Invasion.....	184
Romans, Antiochus IV and the.....	444	Simon Maccabeus.....	468
Romans in Syria, The.....	493	Simon Maccabeus, Murder of..	478
Ruth, The Book of.....	398	Sinai.....	62ff
Sabbath, The.....	20, 329	Sin-offerings.....	325, 407
Sacred Lot, The.....	120	Sirach.....	427
Sacred Trees.....	46	Sisera.....	91
Sacrifice, Prophetic View of....	214	Slavery.....	174
Sadducees, The.....	480	So, King of Egypt.....	228
Sagas, Nature of.....	42	Sodom, Destruction of.....	45, 48
Samaria, Fall of.....	229	Solomon, Psalms of.....	496
Samaritan Text.....	22	Solomon's Buildings.....	162
Samaritan, Settlers, The.....	231	Solomon's Coronation.....	153
Samaritan Schism, The.....	399	Solomon's Harem.....	160
Samson.....	101	Solomon's Palace.....	162
Samuel.....	108	Solomon's Policy.....	156
Samuel, Books of.....	7	Solomon's Wealth.....	159
Samuel as Judge.....	111	Solomon's Wisdom.....	160
Sanballat.....	384	Song of Moses, The.....	291
Sanctuaries, Israelite.....	46	Song of Songs.....	426
Sanhedrin, The.....	481	Sons of God.....	14
Sanhedrin, Herod and the.....	494	Spirit of Yahweh.....	103
Sargon.....	229	Sufferings, Meaning of Israel's..	373
Sargon's Invasion of Philistia..	242	Swine, Uncleaness of.....	334
Satan.....	356	Synagogue, The.....	434
Satan in the Book of Job.....	365	Syncretism.....	190
Saul's Character.....	127	Syncretism, Samaritan.....	231
Saul's Death.....	133	Syncretism of Solomon.....	169
Saul and Samuel.....	108	Syria and Asa.....	186
Saul and the Gibeonites.....	149	Syrian Deluge Story.....	30
Saul and the Prophets.....	110	Tabernacle, The.....	71
Saul in David's Power.....	131	Tabernacle, Account of the....	402
Saul's Jealousy of David.....	123	Taboo.....	334
Saul's Later Years.....	126	Talio.....	174
Saul's Mania.....	122	Tammuz in the Temple.....	306
Saul's Vow.....	119	Tatnai, Governor of Syria.....	352
Scribes, Importance of the....	436	Temple, The.....	161ff
Scribes, The.....	430, 497	Temple, Changes in the.....	236
Scythian Invasion, The.....	275	Temple, Chronicler's Estimate of	
Sea, The Molten.....	166	the.....	422
Seleucus, Kingdom of.....	416	Temple Desecrated.....	444
Sennacherib's Invasion.....	243	Temple of Ezekiel, The.....	321
Sennacherib's Retreat.....	244	Temple, Haggai's Exhortation..	349
Serpent, The.....	13	Temple, Importance of the....	271
Serpent, The Copper.....	239	Temple Income, The.....	204
Serpent Worship.....	240	Temple, Rededication of the...	459
Seth, Genealogy of.....	20	Temple Servants.....	170
Seventy Weeks of Daniel.....	455	Temple Service, Ben Sira's De-	
Sexual Life, Religion and the..	336	scription.....	431
Shallum.....	219	Ten Tribes, The.....	230
Shalmaneser II.....	194	Teraphim, The.....	124
Shalmaneser IV.....	228	Theophanies.....	46
Sheba's Revolt.....	149	Tibni.....	184
Shechem, Revolt of.....	98	Tiglath-pileser III.....	225
Shiloh.....	112	Tiglath-pileser at Damascus...	236
Shimei.....	149	Tribal Names.....	38

	PAGE		PAGE
Tribal Organization, The	173	Yahweh, God of the Desert.	68, 190
Tribes of Israel, The	94	Yahweh, God of Israel.....	104
Trypho	468	Yahweh a jealous God.....	266
Trypho proclaims himself King	468	Yahweh a God of War.....	94
Unity of God.....	270	Yahweh, God of the Whole	
Unity of the Sanctuary.....	270	Earth.....	213
Urim and Thummim.....	121	Yahweh, Wrath of.....	212
Uzzah, Death of	144	Yahwist, Work of the.....	210
Uzziah.....	232	Zadok, Family of	324
Vicarious Suffering	374	Zechariah of Israel.....	226
Wilderness of Judah.....	129	Zechariah, his Visions	354
Wilderness Sojourn, The.....	61	Zedekiah and Jeremiah.....	296
Wilderness Wandering	65	Zedekiah captured	296
Wisdom Literature, The	427	Zedekiah, King of Judah.....	292
Wisdom, Praise of	428	Zephaniah, The Book of	276
Woman, Sacredness of.....	337	Zerubbabel.....	351
		Ziklag	132
		Zimri.....	183

INDEX OF SCRIPTURE PASSAGES

GENESIS.	PAGE
2, 10-15	24
4, 17-24	20
4, 23f.	24
5, 1-32	20
6, 1-4	14
6, 5	27
8, 6	27
10	38
11, 1-9	13
14	37
18, 23-33	250
21	37
25, 1-6	39
25, 12-17	39
27, 39f.	41
28	45
34	42
35, 20	220
36	39
49	40, 175

EXODUS.	
3, 9-25	53
3, 14	57
4, 24-26	67
6, 2-9	53
8, 26	59
14, 1-3	60
17, 1-8	62
20-23	174
23, 12-19	69
23, 29	231
33, 7	402
33, 14	68
34	68, 210
35-40	403

LEVITICUS.	
10, 1-5	403
11	333
16	403, 405
17, 26	333
18, 6-30	335
21-22	337
26, 33	338

NUMBERS.	PAGE
3, 5-13	404
5, 11-31	406
7	408
10, 35	112
11, 24-30	70
19	404
20, 1-13	404
21, 1-3	84
21, 4-9	239
21, 14	76
21, 27-30	76

DEUTERONOMY.	
6, 4	270
12, 8	266
13	267
15, 12-18	294
16, 1-8	267
18, 1-8	323
18, 6	266
18, 10	267
20, 16-18	269
26, 17	268
28	265
32	291
33	209
33, 2	62

JUDGES.	
1	86
5	40
11, 12-28	101
14, 6	103
18	85
19	45

1 SAMUEL.	
2, 12-17	111
5-7	113
7, 13	111
10, 9-13	109
11	116
13 and 14	120
14, 36-45	121
14, 47	126

1 SAMUEL—Cont'd.	PAGE
15	125
19, 18-24	109
21, 4-6	337
22, 6-19	125
23	133
24	131
26	131
27	132

2 SAMUEL.	
2, 8-3, 39	141
2-4	134
3, 6-39	139
7	145
7	340
9	150
11	148
15, 1-6	148
16	149
20, 23-26	147
21, 4-6	150

1 KINGS.	
1, 9	152
1 and 2	153
4	156
5, 27-30	158
8, 8	164
9, 15-19	158
9, 28	159
10, 28	160
11, 14-22	170
11, 23-25	171
12	179
12, 25-33	181
14, 23f.	182
14, 25-28	185
15, 11-13	185
15, 16-32	186
15, 27	183
16, 8-10	183
18	192
20, 35-43	193
21, 19	188
22, 43	197

2 KINGS.		NEHEMIAH— <i>Cont'd.</i>		ISAIAH— <i>Continued.</i>	
	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
3, 26.....	100	6, 1-14.....	388	39.....	242
8, 12.....	201	7.....	347	40-66.....	371
9.....	198	7, 57-60.....	170	41, 1-4.....	377
11, 4-20.....	204	13.....	399	41, 6, 7.....	372
12, 4-16.....	205			41, 21-23.....	372
12, 18.....	206	JOB.		42, 1-4.....	377
13, 3.....	206	7, 12-21.....	367	45, 14.....	374
14, 1-14.....	208	9, 2-5.....	368	46, 1-4.....	372
14, 22.....	232	19, 23-27.....	369	49, 1-6.....	375
14, 25.....	208	38.....	370	49, 14-50, 3.....	373
15, 16.....	219			50, 4-6.....	475
15, 37.....	233	PSALMS.		53.....	376
16, 3.....	235	35, 11-15.....	472	55, 5.....	375
16, 7.....	227	42.....	473	56, 6.....	379
16, 9.....	228	44.....	473	56, 9.....	378
16, 18.....	236			61.....	379
17, 6.....	229	PROVERBS.		63, 1-6.....	379
17, 24.....	230	8, 22-27.....	433		
17, 24-34.....	231	10-22.....	432	JEREMIAH.	
18.....	244			2, 1-II.....	287
18, 1.....	238	ECCLESIASTES.		3, 1-5.....	287
18, 4.....	14	3, 1-9.....	438	4, 5-26.....	276
18, 7.....	241	3, 16-21.....	438	7, 4-15.....	278
18, 13.....	239	8, 16-18.....	437	7, 5-7.....	288
18, 13-16.....	243			7, 17.....	269
20, 12-19.....	242	ISAIAH.		7, 22.....	288
21, 2-6.....	254	1, 5.....	250	8, 8.....	273
21, 16.....	257	2, 6.....	233	11, 15.....	288
22, 3-13.....	260	2, 2-5.....	358	13, 18-20.....	291
23.....	262	2, 12-17.....	234	17, 19-27.....	331
23, 29.....	280	3, 16-24.....	255	18.....	290
23, 33.....	282	6, 9.....	251	22, 13-19.....	282
24, 1.....	283	6, 13.....	251	22, 24-30.....	284
24, 7.....	283	7 and 8.....	235	27.....	293
		9, 7-9.....	234	29.....	294
I CHRONICLES.		10, 5-7.....	249	34, 8-22.....	295
27.....	421	10, 28-32.....	248	35.....	291
		11, 1-8.....	252	35, 1-II.....	191
2 CHRONICLES.		13 and 14.....	343	36.....	289
21, 12-20.....	421	14, 28-32.....	241	44.....	298
33, 11-19.....	258	18.....	247	51, 59.....	294
		20.....	242	52, 28-30.....	297
EZRA.		21, 1-10.....	343		
1, 1-4.....	344	22.....	249	EZEKIEL.	
2.....	347	24-27.....	410	3, 1-3.....	304
4, 12.....	348	25, 6-8.....	411	3, 15-21.....	313
5, 3-6, 14.....	351	28, 1-4.....	234	4, 1-7.....	304
7, 12-26.....	391	28, 17.....	248	5, 1-4.....	305
9 and 10.....	394	28, 28f.....	246	8, 9-12.....	305
		29.....	248	12, 1-20.....	305
NEHEMIAH.		30, 1-5.....	247	11, 1-13.....	307
1, 9.....	383	30, 15.....	248	14, 14.....	364
4, 6.....	386	34 and 35.....	379	14, 20-23.....	310
5, 1-13.....	387	36.....	244	15, 1-5.....	307
5, 14-19.....	387			16.....	308

EZEKIEL—*Continued.*

	PAGE
17.....	308
18.....	310
19.....	308
19, 3-5	282
21, 18-23	309
23	308
23, 10-12	330
24, 15-27	309
33, 1-16	313
34	315
34, 23	320
34, 26-30	314
35	315
36, 26	319
37, 1-10	318
38, 8	316
38, 16	317
39, 8-15	317
40-48	321
43, 7	322
44, 6-15	323
45, 13-17	320
45, 17-20	325
46, 13-16	320
47, 1-12	326

DANIEL.

7, 7	414
7, 9-14	454
8, 5-8	414
8, 14	454
10.....	452
11.....	452
11, 31	446
12, 7	454

HOSEA.

	PAGE
1, 2-9	221
2, 5	222
5, 15-6, 4.....	224
13, 11	225
14, 2-7	223

AMOS.

1, 3	202
1 and 2	216
3, 2	213
5, 15	217
5, 18-20	216
5, 21	214
6, 1-6	215
6, 13	208
7, 9	211
8, 1	212
9, 11-15	217

MICAH.

2, 11	253
3, 2	253
3, 5 and 12.....	253
4, 1-4	358
6, 6-8	257

NAHUM.

1, 2 and 3.....	278
2 and 3	277

ZEPHANIAH.

3, 1-7	276
--------------	-----

HAGGAI.

	PAGE
1, 1-4	349
2, 6	354

ZECHARIAH.

1-8	349
1, 7-2, 5.....	356
3, 6	357
5.....	358
6, 11	357
8, 20-23	358
9-14	423

MALACHI.

1, 2	361
2, 10-16	361
3, 2-5	361
3, 8-10	362
3, 13-15	362

ECCLESIASTICUS.

4, 11-15	429
24, 1-6	429
24, 8-23	429
38, 24-39, 11....	436
50, 18-21	431

I MACCABEES.

1, 21-24	444
2, 42	448
5, 1-5	460
5, 55-68	461
6, 8-13	461
9, 5-19	465
14, 27-49	470

The International Theological Library

ARRANGEMENT OF VOLUMES AND AUTHORS

THEOLOGICAL ENCYCLOPÆDIA. By CHARLES A. BRIGGS, D.D., D.Litt., sometime Professor of Theological Encyclopædia and Symbolics, Union Theological Seminary, New York.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE LITERATURE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. By S. R. DRIVER, D.D., D.Litt., sometime Regius Professor of Hebrew and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford.

[Revised and Enlarged Edition.]

CANON AND TEXT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. By the Rev. JOHN SKINNER, D.D., Principal and Professor of Old Testament Language and Literature, College of the Presbyterian Church of England, Cambridge, England, and the Rev. OWEN WHITEHOUSE, B.A., Principal and Professor of Hebrew, Chestnut College, Cambridge, England.

OLD TESTAMENT HISTORY. By HENRY PRESERVED SMITH, D.D., Librarian, Union Theological Seminary, New York.

[Now Ready.]

THEOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. By A. B. DAVIDSON, D.D., LL.D., sometime Professor of Hebrew, New College, Edinburgh.

[Now Ready.]

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE LITERATURE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. By Rev. JAMES MOFFATT, B.D., Minister United Free Church, Broughty Ferry, Scotland.

[Revised Edition.]

CANON AND TEXT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. By CASPAR RENÉ GREGORY, D.D., LL.D., sometime Professor of New Testament Exegesis in the University of Leipzig.

[Now Ready.]

THE INTERNATIONAL THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY

A HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY IN THE APOSTOLIC AGE. By ARTHUR C. MCGIFFERT, D.D., President Union Theological Seminary, New York. [Now Ready.]

CONTEMPORARY HISTORY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. By FRANK C. PORTER, D.D., Professor of Biblical Theology, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

THEOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. By GEORGE B. STEVENS, D.D., sometime Professor of Systematic Theology, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. [Now Ready.]

BIBLICAL ARCHÆOLOGY. By G. BUCHANAN GRAY, D.D., Professor of Hebrew, Mansfield College, Oxford.

THE ANCIENT CATHOLIC CHURCH. By ROBERT RAINEY, D.D., LL.D., sometime Principal of New College, Edinburgh. [Now Ready.]

THE LATIN CHURCH IN THE MIDDLE AGES. By ANDRE LAGARDE. [Now Ready.]

THE GREEK AND EASTERN CHURCHES. By W. F. ADENEY, D.D., Principal of Independent College, Manchester. [Now Ready.]

THE REFORMATION IN GERMANY. By T. M. LINDSAY, D.D., Principal of the United Free College, Glasgow. [Now Ready.]

THE REFORMATION IN LANDS BEYOND GERMANY. By T. M. LINDSAY, D.D. [Now Ready.]

THEOLOGICAL SYMBOLICS. By CHARLES A. BRIGGS, D.D., D.Litt., sometime Professor of Theological Encyclopædia and Symbolics, Union Theological Seminary, New York. [Now Ready.]

HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE. By G. P. FISHER, D.D., LL.D., sometime Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. [Revised and Enlarged Edition.]

CHRISTIAN INSTITUTIONS. By A. V. G. ALLEN, D.D., sometime Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Protestant Episcopal Divinity School, Cambridge, Mass. [Now Ready.]

PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION. By GEORGE GALLOWAY, D.D., Minister of United Free Church, Castle Douglas, Scotland. [Now Ready.]

HISTORY OF RELIGIONS. I. China, Japan, Egypt, Babylonia, Assyria, India, Persia, Greece, Rome. By GEORGE F. MOORE, D.D., LL.D., Professor in Harvard University. [Now Ready.]

HISTORY OF RELIGIONS. II. Judaism, Christianity, Mohammedanism. By GEORGE F. MOORE, D.D., LL.D., Professor in Harvard University. [Now Ready.]

APOLOGETICS. By A. B. BRUCE, D.D., sometime Professor of New Testament Exegesis, Free Church College, Glasgow. [Revised and Enlarged Edition.]

THE INTERNATIONAL THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY

THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF GOD. By WILLIAM N. CLARKE, D.D., sometime Professor of Systematic Theology, Hamilton Theological Seminary.
[Now Ready.]

THE DOCTRINE OF MAN. By WILLIAM P. PATERSON, D.D., Professor of Divinity, University of Edinburgh.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE PERSON OF JESUS CHRIST. By H. R. MACKINTOSH, Ph.D., D.D., Professor of Theology, New College, Edinburgh.
[Now Ready.]

THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF SALVATION. By GEORGE B. STEVENS, D.D., sometime Professor of Systematic Theology, Yale University.
[Now Ready.]

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHRISTIAN LIFE. By WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN, D.D., Professor of Systematic Theology, Union Theological Seminary, New York.

CHRISTIAN ETHICS. By NEWMAN SMYTH, D.D., Pastor of Congregational Church, New Haven.
[Revised and Enlarged Edition.]

THE CHRISTIAN PASTOR AND THE WORKING CHURCH. By WASHINGTON GLADDEN, D.D., sometime Pastor of Congregational Church, Columbus, Ohio.
[Now Ready.]

THE CHRISTIAN PREACHER. By A. E. GARVIE, D.D., Principal of New College, London, England.
[Now Ready.]

HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN MISSIONS. By CHARLES HENRY ROBINSON, D.D., Hon. Canon of Ripon Cathedral and Editorial Secretary of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts.
[Now Ready.]

The International Critical Commentary

ARRANGEMENT OF VOLUMES AND AUTHORS

THE OLD TESTAMENT

GENESIS. The Rev. JOHN SKINNER, D.D., Principal and Professor of Old Testament Language and Literature, College of Presbyterian Church of England, Cambridge, England. *[Now Ready.]*

EXODUS. The Rev. A. R. S. KENNEDY, D.D., Professor of Hebrew, University of Edinburgh.

LEVITICUS. J. F. STENNING, M.A., Fellow of Wadham College, Oxford.

NUMBERS. The Rev. G. BUCHANAN GRAY, D.D., Professor of Hebrew, Mansfield College, Oxford. *[Now Ready.]*

DEUTERONOMY. The Rev. S. R. DRIVER, D.D., D.Litt., sometime Regius Professor of Hebrew, Oxford. *[Now Ready.]*

JOSHUA. The Rev. GEORGE ADAM SMITH, D.D., LL.D., Principal of the University of Aberdeen.

JUDGES. The Rev. GEORGE F. MOORE, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Theology, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. *[Now Ready.]*

SAMUEL. The Rev. H. P. SMITH, D.D., Librarian, Union Theological Seminary, New York. *[Now Ready.]*

KINGS. *[Author to be announced.]*

CHRONICLES. The Rev. EDWARD L. CURTIS, D.D., Professor of Hebrew, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. *[Now Ready.]*

EZRA AND NEHEMIAH. The Rev. L. W. BATTEN, Ph.D., D.D., Professor of Old Testament Literature, General Theological Seminary, New York City. *[Now Ready.]*

PSALMS. The Rev. CHAS. A. BRIGGS, D.D., D.Litt., sometime Graduate Professor of Theological Encyclopædia and Symbolics, Union Theological Seminary, New York. *[2 vols. Now Ready.]*

PROVERBS. The Rev. C. H. TOY, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Hebrew, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. *[Now Ready.]*

JOB. The Rev. G. BUCHANAN GRAY, D.D., Professor of Hebrew, Mansfield College, Oxford, and the Rev. S. R. DRIVER, D.D., D.Litt., sometime Regius Professor of Hebrew, Oxford. *[In Press.]*

THE INTERNATIONAL CRITICAL COMMENTARY

ISAIAH. Chaps. I-XXVII. The Rev. G. BUCHANAN GRAY, D.D., Professor of Hebrew, Mansfield College, Oxford. [Now Ready.]

ISAIAH. Chaps. XXVIII-XXXIX. The Rev. G. BUCHANAN GRAY, D.D. Chaps. LX-LXVI. The Rev. A. S. PEAKE, M.A., D.D., Dean of the Theological Faculty of the Victoria University and Professor of Biblical Exegesis in the University of Manchester, England.

JEREMIAH. The Rev. A. F. KIRKPATRICK, D.D., Dean of Ely, sometime Regius Professor of Hebrew, Cambridge, England.

EZEKIEL. The Rev. G. A. COOKE, M.A., Oriel Professor of the Interpretation of Holy Scripture, University of Oxford, and the Rev. CHARLES F. BURNEY, D.Litt., Fellow and Lecturer in Hebrew, St. John's College, Oxford.

DANIEL. The Rev. JOHN P. PETERS, Ph.D., D.D., sometime Professor of Hebrew, P. E. Divinity School, Philadelphia, now Rector of St. Michael's Church, New York City.

AMOS AND HOSEA. W. R. HARPER, Ph.D., LL.D., sometime President of the University of Chicago, Illinois. [Now Ready.]

MICAH, ZEPHANIAH, NAHUM, HABAKKUK, OBADIAH AND JOEL. Prof. JOHN M. P. SMITH, University of Chicago; W. HAYES WARD, D.D., LL.D., Editor of *The Independent*, New York; Prof. JULIUS A. BEWER, Union Theological Seminary, New York. [Now Ready.]

HAGGAI, ZECHARIAH, MALACHI AND JONAH. Prof. H. G. MITCHELL, D.D.; Prof. JOHN M. P. SMITH, Ph.D., and Prof. J. A. BEWER, Ph.D. [Now Ready.]

ESTHER. The Rev. L. B. PATON, Ph.D., Professor of Hebrew, Hartford Theological Seminary. [Now Ready.]

ECCLESIASTES. Prof. GEORGE A. BARTON, Ph.D., Professor of Biblical Literature, Bryn Mawr College, Pa. [Now Ready.]

RUTH, SONG OF SONGS AND LAMENTATIONS. Rev. CHARLES A. BRIGGS, D.D., D.Litt., sometime Graduate Professor of Theological Encyclopædia and Symbolics, Union Theological Seminary, New York.

THE NEW TESTAMENT

ST. MATTHEW. The Rev. WILLOUGHBY C. ALLEN, M.A., Fellow and Lecturer in Theology and Hebrew, Exeter College, Oxford. [Now Ready.]

ST. MARK. Rev. E. P. GOULD, D.D., sometime Professor of New Testament Literature, P. E. Divinity School, Philadelphia. [Now Ready.]

ST. LUKE. The Rev. ALFRED PLUMMER, D.D., late Master of University College, Durham. [Now Ready.]

THE INTERNATIONAL CRITICAL COMMENTARY

ST. JOHN. The Right Rev. JOHN HENRY BERNARD, D.D., Bishop of Ossory, Ireland.

HARMONY OF THE GOSPELS. The Rev. WILLIAM SANDAY, D.D., LL.D., Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity, Oxford, and the Rev. WILLOUGHBY C. ALLEN, M.A., Fellow and Lecturer in Divinity and Hebrew, Exeter College, Oxford.

ACTS. The Rev. C. H. TURNER, D.D., Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, and the Rev. H. N. BATE, M.A., Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of London.

ROMANS. The Rev. WILLIAM SANDAY, D.D., LL.D., Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford, and the Rev. A. C. HEADLAM, M.A., D.D., Principal of King's College, London.

[*Now Ready.*]

I. CORINTHIANS. The Right Rev. ARCH ROBERTSON, D.D., LL.D., Lord Bishop of Exeter, and Rev. ALFRED PLUMMER, D.D., late Master of University College, Durham.

[*Now Ready.*]

II. CORINTHIANS. The Rev. ALFRED PLUMMER, M.A., D.D., late Master of University College, Durham.

[*Now Ready.*]

GALATIANS. The Rev. ERNEST D. BURTON, D.D., Professor of New Testament Literature, University of Chicago.

[*Now Ready.*]

EPHESIANS AND COLOSSIANS. The Rev. T. K. ABBOTT, B.D., D.Litt., sometime Professor of Biblical Greek, Trinity College, Dublin, now Librarian of the same.

[*Now Ready.*]

PHILIPPIANS AND PHILEMON. The Rev. MARVIN R. VINCENT, D.D., Professor of Biblical Literature, Union Theological Seminary, New York City.

[*Now Ready.*]

THESSALONIANS. The Rev. JAMES E. FRAME, M.A., Professor of Biblical Theology, Union Theological Seminary, New York City.

[*Now Ready.*]

THE PASTORAL EPISTLES. The Rev. WALTER LOCK, D.D., Warden of Keble College and Professor of Exegesis, Oxford.

HEBREWS. The Rev. JAMES MOFFATT, D.D., Minister United Free Church, Broughty Ferry, Scotland.

ST. JAMES. The Rev. JAMES H. ROPES, D.D., Bussey Professor of New Testament Criticism in Harvard University.

[*Now Ready.*]

PETER AND JUDE. The Rev. CHARLES BIGG, D.D., sometime Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford.

[*Now Ready.*]

THE JOHANNINE EPISTLES. The Rev. E. A. BROOKE, B.D., Fellow and Divinity Lecturer in King's College, Cambridge.

[*Now Ready.*]

REVELATION. The Rev. ROBERT H. CHARLES, M.A., D.D., sometime Professor of Biblical Greek in the University of Dublin. [2 vols. *Now Ready.*]

Date Due

[illegible]

BS1197 .S649 1921
Old Testament history,

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00048 0774